



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 166

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 2020

No. 2

## House of Representatives

The House was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Tuesday, January 7, 2020, at 2 p.m.

## Senate

MONDAY, JANUARY 6, 2020

The Senate met at 3 p.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. GRASSLEY).

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Eternal God, we are gratefully aware that You are the giver of every good and perfect gift. You shower us with Your mercies each day.

We are further aware of our unworthiness because of Your goodness. We all, like sheep, have gone astray. Lord, we are prone to wander and to leave You, the God we love.

As our Senators work today, make them extensions of Your power in our world. Use them as Your eyes, ears, hands, and feet to accomplish Your purposes. Lord, make them Your ambassadors. May they arrange their priorities according to Your will and view their challenges from an ethical perspective, striving to seek Your will in all they think, say, and do. May they find, in challenging moments, opportunities to renew their faith in You.

We pray in Your merciful Name. Amen.

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The President pro tempore led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY). The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask permission to address the Senate for 1 minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### LEGISLATIVE AGENDA

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I want to wish all Iowans and maybe, in turn, all Americans a happy New Year. As 2020 begins, I am focused on passing the United States-Mexico-Canada trade agreement. I am leading a meeting of the Finance Committee tomorrow to report out the bill, so the Senate floor vote is imminent.

I am continuing to work, in a bipartisan way, to lower the cost of prescription drugs with the Grassley-Wyden Prescription Drug Pricing Reduction Act.

In the coming weeks, I will begin my 40th annual 99-county tour of my State to continue to hear what is on the minds of Iowans so that I can better serve them in the U.S. Senate.

I look forward to remaining in touch with Iowans as the new decade begins. I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader is recognized.

### IRAN

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, as the Senate convenes this afternoon, we find our Nation facing two grave and serious choices. One concerns our unity at home and the future of our Constitution. The other involves our strength abroad and the security of our homeland. Both situations demand serious, sober treatment from Congress. Both require that we put enduring national interests ahead of the factionalism and short-termism the Founding Fathers warned us about. But, unfortunately, seriousness has been in short supply lately—in very short supply—from the determined critics of President Trump, and our Nation, of course, is worse for it.

Last Thursday, the United States took decisive action to end the murderous scheming of Iran's chief terrorist. Qasem Soleimani had spent numerous years masterminding attacks on American servicemembers and our partners throughout the Middle East and expanding Iran's influence. Despite sanctions and despite prohibitions by the U.N. Security Council, he roamed throughout the region with impunity.

His hands bore the blood of more American servicemembers than anyone else alive. Hundreds of American families have buried loved ones because of him. Veterans have learned to live with permanent injuries inflicted by his terrorists. In Iraq, Syria, and beyond, the

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

entire region felt the effects of his evil tactics.

We should welcome his death and its complication of Tehran's terrorism-industrial complex, but we must remain vigilant and soberly prepared for even further aggression.

It is completely appropriate that this decision would generate interest and questions from this body. We can and we should learn more about the intelligence and thinking that led to this operation and the plan to defend American personnel and interests in the wake of it.

I am glad the administration will hold an all-Senators briefing on Wednesday. It will be led by Secretary of Defense Esper, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Milley, Secretary of State Pompeo, and CIA Director Haspel.

Unfortunately, in this toxic political environment, some of our colleagues rushed to blame our own government before even knowing the facts, rushed to split hairs about intelligence before being briefed on it, and rushed to downplay Soleimani's evil while presenting our own President as the villain.

Soon after the news broke, one of our distinguished colleagues made a public statement that rightly called Soleimani a "murderer" and then, amazingly, walked that message back when the far left objected to the factual statement. Since then, I believe all of her criticism has been directed at our own President.

Another of our Democratic colleagues has been thinking out loud about Middle East policy on social media. Mere days before President Trump's decision, this Senator tore into the White House for what he described as weakness and inaction. "No one fears us" he complained. "Trump has rendered America impotent in the Middle East." But since the strike, he has done a complete 180. That same Senator has harshly criticized our own President for getting tough. Ludicrously, he and others on the left have accused the administration of committing an illegal act and equated the removal of this terrorist leader with a foreign power assassinating our own Secretary of Defense.

Here is what one expert had to say about it. Jeh Johnson, President Obama's own former Pentagon general counsel and Secretary of Homeland Security, said:

If you believe everything that our government is saying about General Soleimani, he was a lawful military objective, and the president, under his constitutional authority as commander in chief, had ample domestic legal authority to take him out without—

Without—  
an additional congressional authorization. Whether he was a terrorist or a general in a military force that was engaged in armed attacks against our people, he was a lawful military objective.

That was the former Secretary of Homeland Security in the Obama administration, Jeh Johnson, an expert on these things.

Our former colleague, Joe Lieberman, who ran for Vice President on the Democratic ticket in 2000, wrote this morning: "In their uniformly skeptical or negative reactions to Soleimani's death, Democrats are . . . creating the risk that the U.S. will be seen as acting and speaking with less authority abroad at this important time." That is how a former Democratic Senator sees it.

The Senate is supposed to be the Chamber where overheated partisan passions give way to sober judgment. Can we not at least wait until we know the facts? Can we not maintain a shred—just a shred—of national unity for 5 minutes—for 5 minutes—before deepening the partisan trenches?

Must Democrats' distaste for this President dominate every thought they express and every decision they make? Is that really the seriousness that this situation deserves?

The full Senate will be briefed on Wednesday. I expect the committees of oversight will also conduct hearings and that the Senators will have plenty of opportunities to discuss our interests and policies in the region.

I urge my colleagues to bring a full awareness of the facts, mindfulness of the long history of Iran's aggression toward the United States and its allies, and a sober understanding of the threat Iran continues to pose.

Could we at least remember we are all Americans first, and we are all in this together?

---

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, in the meantime, at this dangerous time, House Democrats continue to play political games with their partisan impeachment of the Commander in Chief. Last year, House Democrats conducted the least thorough, most rushed, most unfair impeachment inquiry in history. For weeks, Democrats said they could not wait for due process, could not conduct a normal or fair inquiry because removing the President from office was so incredibly urgent—incredibly urgent.

Well, the unseriousness was obvious then and should be even more obvious now because Speaker PELOSI is now sitting on the articles she claimed were so very urgent. She has delayed this indefinitely so the architects of the failed House process can look for ways to reach over here into the Senate and dictate our process as well.

Democrats have tried to insist that the Senate deviate from the unanimous bipartisan precedent set in the 1999 trial of President Clinton and write new rules for President Trump. They have tried to precommit the Senate to redoing House Democrats' slapdash work for them and pursuing avenues Chairman SCHIFF himself didn't bother to pursue.

The Senate has a unanimous bipartisan precedent for when to handle midtrial questions such as witnesses:

in the middle of the trial. That is when that was done the last time, and that is the way it should be done this time.

In 1999, every single U.S. Senator agreed to establish basic parameters for the start of the trial upfront and reserve midtrial questions, such as witnesses, until later. The vote was 100 to 0. That was good enough for President Clinton, so it ought to be good enough for President Trump. Fair is fair.

House Democrats' hunger to break our Senate precedents, just like they broke their own House precedents, could not be more telling, but the Senate does not just bob along on the currents of every news cycle. The House may have been content to scrap their own norms to hurt President Trump, but that is not the Senate. Even with a process this constitutionally serious, even with tensions rising in the Middle East, House Democrats are treating impeachment like a political toy—like a political toy—treating their own effort to remove our Commander in Chief like some frivolous game.

These bizarre stunts do not serve our Constitution or our national security. They erode both. My Democratic colleagues should not plow away American unity in some bizarre intramural competition to see who dislikes the President more.

They should not disdain our Constitution by rushing through a purely partisan impeachment process and then toying around with it. Governing is serious business. The American people deserve better, a lot better than this.

---

#### RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

---

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

---

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

---

#### EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session to resume consideration of the following nomination, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

---

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 329.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Matthew H. Solomson, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 462.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby

move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eleni Maria Roumel, of Maryland, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Federal Claims for a term of fifteen years.

Mitch McConnell, Mike Crapo, Thom Tillis, Mike Rounds, Lamar Alexander, John Hoeven, Roger F. Wicker, Pat Roberts, John Thune, Cindy Hyde-Smith, John Boozman, Tom Cotton, Chuck Grassley, Kevin Cramer, Steve Daines, Todd Young, John Cornyn.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to legislative session. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION

## EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I move to proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 525.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion. The motion was agreed to.

The clerk will report the nomination. The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

## CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Michael George DeSombre, of Illinois, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Kingdom of Thailand.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, James M. Inhofe, John Barrasso, Roy Blunt, Todd Young, Shelley Moore Capito, Michael B. Enzi, Lisa Murkowski, John Cornyn, Steve Daines, Lindsey Graham, Chuck Grassley, Josh Hawley, Roger F. Wicker, Marsha Blackburn.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the mandatory quorum calls be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## RECOGNITION OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Democratic leader is recognized.

## IRAN

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, it has been 4 days since the United States carried out a military operation that killed Major General Qasem Soleimani, the commander of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force. In the days since, I have become increasingly alarmed about the strike, a strike that

was carried out with insufficient transparency, without consultation of Congress, and without a clear plan for what comes next.

President Trump had promised to keep the United States out of endless wars in the Middle East. The President's actions, however, have seemingly increased the risk that we could be dragged into exactly such a war. It is indicative of President Trump's foreign policy record, which is riddled by chaotic, uninformed, erratic, and impulsive decision-making without adequate consideration for the consequences.

In just about every foreign policy area President Trump touches, we are worse off than we were before he started with it. Whether it is with China, North Korea, Syria, Russia, the President has careened from one impulsive action to the next, with no coherent strategy. North Korea today—despite what President Trump said, we don't have to worry about them—is a greater nuclear threat than they have ever been. Trump's actions have been disastrous. North Korea has more nuclear weapons, and, by all reports, has either developed or is very close to developing an ICBM that can hit the U.S. mainland. That is a result of President Trump's bumbling.

The situation in Syria is much worse than before. Doing what he did in Syria, pulling out those troops, made no sense to anybody, even the most hawkish foreign policy people we have, and every time the President seems to deal with Putin, Putin seems to come out ahead. Looking at the President's chaotic and rudderless foreign policy in hotspots around the globe, it is hard to conclude that any of the situations are better off than when the President took office 3 years ago. His policies seem to be characterized by erratic, impulsive, and often egotistical behavior, with little regard to a long-term strategy that would advance the interests of the United States.

At times like this, it is essential for Congress to provide a check on the President and assert our constitutional role in matters of war and peace. In my view, President Trump does not—does not—have authority to go to war with Iran. There are several important pieces of legislation that seek to, again, assert Congress's authority and prerogative on these matters.

Senator Kaine has a War Powers Resolution that would force a debate and vote in Congress to seek to prevent further escalation of hostilities with Iran. That resolution will be privileged, so it will have to come to the floor. My colleagues, we are going to vote on it.

Senator Sanders has introduced a bill that would block funding for the war with Iran. I am supportive of both Senator Kaine's and Senator Sanders' efforts, and I urge the Senate to consider both in the coming days.

Additionally, the Trump administration must start acting with greater transparency. By law, the Trump administration must make a notification

to Congress when it conducts a military operation like the one last Friday. That is known as a War Powers Act notification. Unusually, the Trump administration made the notification on Saturday, after the action occurred, and then they did it in a completely classified format.

Let me be clear. An entirely classified notification—in the case of this particular military operation—is simply not appropriate, and there appears to be no legitimate justification for classifying this notification.

Ranking Member MENENDEZ and I sent a letter to the President urging declassification. It is critical that national security matters of such importance—war and peace and the possibility of another “endless war” in the Middle East—that knowledge of the actions and justification should be shared with the American people in a timely manner. It is Americans who will be asked to pay for such a war if it occurs. It is American soldiers who will bravely risk their lives once again.

The reason the Founding Fathers gave Congress war-making authority is very simple: They were afraid of an overreaching Executive. They wanted to make sure that any act as important as war—war and peace—be discussed in an open manner by the Congress so it could be vetted, so questions could be asked, so a small, insular group—and the President’s group seems even more and more insular because anyone of strength and courage, people like Mattis and McMaster, who disagrees with the President because he is so erratic leaves, leaving a bunch of “yes” people who seem to want to do whatever the President wants. That means having a debate in Congress where questions are asked and coming to the American people so that people can hear a justification and see if it is actually a valid one is vital.

The administration still has to answer several very crucial questions about their actions last week. Iran has many dangerous surrogates in the region and a whole range of possible responses. Which responses do we expect? Which are the most likely? What do we know about what Iran would plan to do in retaliation, and what are our plans to counter all of these responses? How effective does our military, does our CIA, does our State Department think these responses will be?

The next question is, What does this action mean for the long-term stability for Iraq? What does it mean for our presence in Iraq? What does it mean to the trillions of dollars—trillions—and thousands of American lives sacrificed there? How does what we are doing now fit into that? How does the administration plan to manage any escalation of the hostilities? How does the administration plan to avoid a larger and potentially endless conflagration in the Middle East?

These are crucial questions. Not one has been answered by the President or anyone in the administration. All of

the tweeting and all of the bravado is no substitute for strategic thinking and long-term foreign policy goals and ways to achieve those goals. This administration seems to be devoid of that. It certainly was when it came to North Korea. It certainly was when it came to Syria. It certainly is when it comes to Russia, and it seems likely the same case is now occurring with Iran.

At a minimum, the questions I mentioned must be answered. This is an important moment for our Nation. The American people need clarity that the Trump administration has a plan—not just a tweet but a plan—to keep our troops, our Nation, and our people safe.

#### IMPEACHMENT

Mr. President, as my colleagues return from the holiday recess, one question looms before us: Will the Senate conduct a fair impeachment trial of the President of the United States? Will we search for all of the facts, or will we look for a coverup—a sham trial—on one of the most important powers the Founding Fathers gave the American people?

The Framers gave the Senate the sole power to try Presidential impeachments because they could not imagine another body with “confidence enough” in its own status to “preserve the necessary impartiality.” It is up to every Senator now to live up to that awesome and profound responsibility.

At the moment, there is a very clear difference of opinion between the Republican leader and myself about what it means to have a fair trial. I believe a fair trial is one that considers all the relevant facts and allows relevant witnesses and documents—a feature of every single impeachment trial of a President in the history of our Nation. We have never had one with no witnesses—not once.

Leader MCCONNELL likes to cite precedent. That precedent stares him in the face, and he can’t answer it. My Republican counterpart believes that a trial should feature no relevant witnesses and none of the relevant documents. He has made clear in his public appearance on FOX News that it should proceed according to the desires of the White House—the defendant in this case. Glaringly, the Republican leader has yet to make one single argument why witnesses should not testify.

I am waiting to hear it, Leader MCCONNELL. Give us specific answers why these witnesses should not come forward. Don’t call names. Don’t finger-point. Don’t get angry at NANCY PELOSI. Tell us why, here in the Senate, witnesses and documents should not come forward that are directly relevant to the charges against the President of the United States of America.

Leader MCCONNELL has sort of exempted himself from fair debate. He doesn’t want a fair trial; he wants a quick and sham trial. Now it is up to every Senator. Every Senator will have a say in deciding which of the two views wins out. Will we have a fair

trial or a coverup? Will we hear the evidence, or will we try to hide it? It will not be me and not the Republican leader alone but a majority of Senators who will decide whether we have a fair trial with facts and evidence or a Senate-sponsored coverup of the President’s alleged misconduct.

Make no mistake—there will be votes on whether to call each of the four witnesses we proposed and subpoena the documents we have identified. Under the rules of the Senate trial, the minority will be able to offer motions subject to a majority vote.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle, your constituents and the voice of history are watching. You will be required to vote on whether we have a fair trial with witnesses and with documents, or you will say: I am running away from the facts. I am scared of the facts. I will go for a coverup.

A few hours ago, the momentum for uncovering the truth in a Senate trial gathered even more momentum. One of the key witnesses I have asked for, Mr. John Bolton, former National Security Advisor to President Trump, correctly acknowledged that he needs to comply with a Senate subpoena for his testimony, if issued. Previously, Mr. Bolton said he was leaving the question of his testimony up to the courts. Today, he made it perfectly clear that he will come if the Senate asks, as he should. The other potential witnesses we have identified—Mr. Mulvaney, Mr. Duffey, and Mr. Blair—should do the same.

We know that Mr. Bolton, like Mr. Mulvaney, Mr. Duffey, and Mr. Blair—the three other witnesses—has crucial, eyewitness knowledge of the President’s dealings with Ukraine, about how decisions were made to withhold security assistance and how opposition within the administration to that delay President Trump seemed to want was overcome.

A simple majority is all it takes to ensure that the Senate issues a subpoena for these witnesses. If only four Republicans decide that Mr. Bolton and the three other witnesses ought to be heard, they will be heard, because every Democrat will vote to hear them. It is now up to four Senate Republicans to support bringing in Mr. Bolton and the three other witnesses, as well as the key documents we have requested, to ensure that all the evidence is presented at the outset of the Senate trial.

Given that Mr. Bolton’s lawyers have stated he has new and relevant information to share, if any Senate Republican opposes issuing subpoenas to the four witnesses and documents we have requested, they would make it absolutely clear they are participating in a coverup on one of the most sacred duties we have in this Congress—in this Senate—and that is to keep a President in check.

Leader MCCONNELL has suggested we follow the 1999 example of beginning the impeachment trial first and then deciding on witnesses and documents

after the arguments are complete. He keeps making this argument. It doesn't gather any steam because it is such a foolish one. Let me again respond for the benefit of my colleagues.

Witnesses and documents are the most important issue, and we should deal with them first. To hear Leader MCCONNELL say "no witnesses now but maybe some later" is just another indication that he has no argument against witnesses and documents on the merits. He is afraid to address the argument because he knows it is a loser for him, so he says: Let's decide it later.

Why? There is no reason. In fact, it is sort of backward. We are going to have all the arguments—pro and con—then say maybe we will have witnesses and documents? We will have the arguments first and the evidence later? As I have said, Leader MCCONNELL's view of the trial is an "Alice in Wonderland" view—first the trial, then the evidence.

More important than precedent is the fact that his analogy plainly doesn't make sense because you don't have both sides present their arguments first and then afterward ask for the evidence that we know is out there. The evidence should inform the trial, not the other way around.

When Leader MCCONNELL proposes that we follow the 1999 precedent, he is essentially arguing that we should conduct the entire impeachment trial first and then once it is over, decide on whether we need witnesses and documents. Again, MCCONNELL's view is "Alice in Wonderland," where we first have the trial and then the evidence. If the Senate were to agree to Leader MCCONNELL's proposal, the Senate would act as little more than a nationally televised meeting of a mock trial club.

Leader MCCONNELL's proposal on witnesses and documents later is a poorly disguised trap. He has already actually made clear what his goals are. He said it on FOX News radio: "After we've heard the arguments, we ought to vote and move on" with no witnesses and no documents.

Well, at least 47 Democrats and I hope some Republicans won't fall for that kind of specious logic. What MCCONNELL said doesn't sound like someone who will reasonably consider witnesses and documents at a later date; he sounds more like someone who has already made up his mind.

You cannot have a fair trial without the facts and without the testimony from witnesses with knowledge of the events and related documents. A trial without all the facts is a farce.

If the President is acquitted at the end of a partisan sham trial with no witnesses and no documents, then his acquittal will not carry much weight in the minds of the American people or in the judgment of history.

President Trump, if you are hurting about this impeachment and you are wishing for a fair trial and a real acquittal, join us in asking for the wit-

nesses to come forward. Join us in asking for the documents. What are you hiding, President Trump? What are you afraid of, President Trump? If you think that you have done nothing wrong, you wouldn't mind having your own witnesses come here. These are people you appointed.

Most Americans know that President Trump seems to be afraid of the truth. And 64 percent of all Republicans who almost always side with President Trump in the polling data say there should be witnesses and documents—64 percent. A trial without all the facts is a farce. The verdicts of a kangaroo court are empty.

It is time for a bipartisan majority in this Chamber, Democrat and Republican, to support the rules and procedures of a fair trial. A vote to allow witnesses and documents does not presume a vote for conviction in any way. It merely ensures that when the ultimate judgment is rendered, whatever that judgment will be, it will be based on the facts. We don't know what the witnesses will say; it could be exculpatory for President Trump or it could be more condemning. Whatever it will be, we should have the facts come out and let the chips fall where they may. The Senate Democrats believe we must conduct a fair trial. As for the Senate Republicans, we will see.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. ERNST). The Senator from Texas.

Mr. CORNYN. Madam President, I have some prepared remarks regarding the Soleimani strike and some other related matters, but I want to take a moment and just respond briefly to my friend, the Democratic leader.

There seems to be a lot of irony involved in this question of the Articles of Impeachment. First of all, of course, Speaker PELOSI, who said this is an urgent fulfilling of a constitutional duty and who wanted the Articles of Impeachment voted on in the House, has been radio silent and appears to be getting cold feet on whether or not she will even send the Articles of Impeachment to the Senate.

I would suggest that the first thing we need to know is if Speaker PELOSI is actually serious about this. If she is not, there is no occasion for us to even begin this conversation about how the Senate trial will proceed. Speaker PELOSI is mistaken if she thinks she can direct or influence the Senate's decision on how the trial will proceed. In fact, one of the things I am pretty sure of is that the Senate will not replicate the circuslike atmosphere of the impeachment inquiry in the House, which was one of the most partisan undertakings I have seen in my time in the Senate.

I think they are really grasping at straws now and are recognizing they did a poor job in developing the case that led to the two Articles of Impeachment. One was because of a disagreement over the manner in which the President exercised his authority

under the Constitution to engage in foreign relations, and the other was based on this bogus idea that by saying: I need to go to court to get some direction on a claim of executive privilege, that somehow, even though Mr. SCHIFF dropped the subpoena or no longer sought that witness's testimony, one has obstructed Congress's investigation. All of this was without even alleging any crime.

I suggest that the Senate is an institution that follows the rules and that we follow our precedents. The most obvious precedent for this impeachment trial is the Clinton impeachment trial. There, we saw 100 Senators agree to a procedure which allowed both sides to present their cases, after which there was a vote to see whether additional testimony would be required. Indeed, there was an agreement to provide three additional witnesses, not live, in a circuslike atmosphere here on the floor of the Senate, but through depositions taken out of court that could then be out of the Chamber, whereby excerpts of those depositions could be offered as additional evidence. That was the procedure that was supported by the Democratic leader, the Senator from New York. I suggest that what was fair for President Clinton is fair for President Trump. It is not much more complicated than that, and that, indeed, is the most relevant precedent.

With regard to this claim that some Senators aren't demonstrating impartiality, I recall reading that the Senator from New York, when he was running against incumbent Senator D'Amato, said a vote for him for the Senate would be a guaranteed vote of acquittal of President Clinton. That was hardly impartial. Now he protests too much and, I think, demonstrates his hypocrisy when it comes to the standard by which he holds himself and others.

I am sorry. I just can't believe that Senator WARREN and Senator SANDERS would qualify under anybody's definition of an impartial juror. Yet that is our constitutional system. I think what has happened is that they realize their case is falling short of any standard by which a President would be convicted and impeached, and they are simply grasping at straws.

IRAN

Madam President, on another matter, last Friday, Americans woke up to the news that one of the most brutal terrorist leaders in the world had been killed. Qasem Soleimani was killed in an airstrike by America's military, finally bringing an end to his decades-long reign of terror.

You could legitimately call General Soleimani a master of disaster because that defined his entire professional life as the leader of Iran's military. Actually, he was the head of the Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps Quds Force, which is a U.S.-designated terrorist organization. General Soleimani was the most consequential military leader in Iran, which has been designated by the U.S. State Department

as a state sponsor of international terrorism since 1984. General Soleimani orchestrated Iran's efforts to squash democracy movements both at home and abroad by any means necessary. He and his army of terrorists exported violence around the region and engaged in gross human rights violations against the Iranian people.

If you are curious how the Iranian Government treats its own citizens, just look at the recent protests that started as complaints over increased gas prices. When the Iranian citizens took to the streets in peaceful protest, the Ayatollah, the Supreme Leader, called them enemy agents and thugs, and the government attacked. As many as 450 Iranians were killed in those peaceful protests, with some 2,000 injured and 7,000 detained. This is not a government that is protecting its people; it is a network of criminals that masquerades as a government. One of the Ayatollah's most loyal henchmen was Soleimani.

In addition to leading attacks on the Iranian people and fueling terrorist operations throughout the Middle East, he also played a crucial role in fomenting Syria's civil war. Soleimani helped to finance and aid the butcher, known as Bashar al-Assad, in the slaughter of the Syrian people. The death toll of the Syrian civil war is estimated to be as high as a half a million Syrians, and the number of refugees and internally displaced persons goes into the millions.

While the greatest death and destruction orchestrated by Soleimani was concentrated in the Middle East, the United States was one of his and Iran's biggest targets. From the Iranian hostage crisis back in 1979, to the Khobar Towers bombing, to the recent shooting down of a U.S. drone, to the death of an American contractor in Iraq, Iran's actions at every turn have demonstrated a desire to make the chant "Death to America" a reality.

Soleimani was known to be responsible for the deaths of hundreds of American soldiers. He and the Iranian regime supplied explosively formed penetrators that cut through American armor like a hot knife through butter and left hundreds of American soldiers—indeed, maybe 1,000 or more—disabled as a result of this deadly instrument of war. Since 2003, at least 600 U.S. soldiers have been killed by Iranian proxies in Iraq, and as I have said, many more have been injured.

I and others in this Chamber have seen their activities firsthand at Brooke Army Medical Center, the Center for the Intrepid in San Antonio, and at other places where they have received treatment, like at Walter Reed Army Medical Center here in Washington, DC. It is where the victims of these Iranian improvised explosive devices were treated for amputation, for burns, or functional limb loss if they survived those injuries in the first place. These soldiers are a reminder of the selfless commitment our men and

women in uniform make each day as well as the perilous threat posed by Iran under Soleimani's leadership.

For decades, since the Iranian Revolution in 1979, Tehran has waged war against the United States and our allies, and recent reports indicate that Soleimani was in the process of plotting even more acts of aggression against the United States and U.S. interests, which is hardly surprising, though, since he had been doing that for many years. That is precisely why he was targeted.

Just as quickly as the news of this attack spread, so did anti-Trump rhetoric. Instead of celebrating the fact that Iran's chief terrorist was dead and could kill no more, a number of our Democratic colleagues chose to bash the President instead. They claimed his action was unauthorized, even illegal, or that he should have sought congressional approval beforehand. None of that is true. The President not only has the authority under the Constitution but the responsibility to defend the United States from terrorist organizations like the Iranian Revolutionary Guard Corps and its leaders like General Soleimani.

This was neither an assassination—a particularly loathsome allegation that has been made on social media—nor an unprovoked attack. This was the President of the United States exercising his lawful authority to protect the United States, our allies, and our national interests just as Presidents before have done. Perhaps the most stark comparison is when Barack Obama directed the killing of Osama bin Laden. Where were the people who now claim that Soleimani's death is an abuse of power? I don't recall anyone calling the killing of Osama bin Laden an assassination. When he was killed, they were not on cable TV, criticizing the move; we were all celebrating.

Some of our Democratic friends will simply never pass on an opportunity to criticize the President—no matter how unfair. Thank goodness there are Democrats like former Department of Homeland Security Secretary Jeh Johnson and former U.S. Senator Joe Lieberman.

Senator Joe Lieberman said:

President Trump's order to take out Qasem Soleimani was morally, constitutionally and strategically correct. It deserves more bipartisan support than the begrudging or negative reactions it has received thus far from my fellow Democrats.

I am also grateful for the informed comments by luminaries like former CENTCOM Commander and former CIA Director General Petraeus as well as Ambassador Ryan Crocker, who have both rightly said that this action was authorized and necessary.

It is unquestionable that the death of Soleimani was a major blow to the Iranian regime and a strong message of deterrence to all state sponsors of terrorism. The blood of hundreds of American soldiers and countless civilians is on Soleimani's hands, and because of

the decisive action taken by President Trump, he is gone.

I fully support this move by the President, and I commend the President's willingness to send a strong message of deterrence to the terrorist threat in the Middle East, particularly against the United States, our citizens, and our interests.

Finally, I join my fellow Senators in thanking the brave men and women in uniform who fought and continue to fight terrorist acts brought about by people like General Soleimani and the Quds Force as part of the IRGC. I especially thank those who are fighting and who are prepared to defend our interests in the Middle East today.

America must never back down in the face of this evil. Our world is safer today because Qasem Soleimani is dead. It would not have been possible without the actions that President Trump has undertaken or without the resolve of our military leaders and our courageous servicemembers who put their lives on the line each day.

116TH CONGRESS

Madam President, on another matter, briefly, we have now crossed the halfway point of the 116th Congress, and it is safe to say that 2019 was an unconventional and a somewhat bumpy year.

After 2 years with Republicans controlling both Chambers of Congress and the White House, we were all prepared for the challenges that would come with a Democratically controlled House. Despite the unnecessary foot-dragging and political gaming and obsession with foiling the President, we were still able to accomplish a lot of good for the country and the people of my State of Texas.

Last month alone, we made major moves to strengthen our military and support our troops. We passed a funding bill that increased the funding by nearly \$20 billion—necessary to restore our readiness—and gave our troops the largest pay raise they had received in a decade.

This complemented the National Defense Authorization Act, which authorized \$400 million for military construction projects in Texas and 90 new F-35 Joint Strike Fighters that will be built in Fort Worth.

It also included a number of provisions that I introduced to support our servicemembers and veterans. In 2016, only 46 percent of Active-Duty military voted by absentee ballot, and one-third of those who didn't vote said that the absentee voting process was simply too complicated.

To make that better, I introduced the Military Voter Protection Act, which became law last month. It makes the absentee voter registration process easier for servicemembers stationed overseas so that a complicated trail of paperwork doesn't prevent them from casting their well-deserved ballots.

I have also heard from my Texas constituents who are veterans, who have

fallen on hard times and had to fight for their VA and Department of Defense disability benefits in bankruptcy proceedings. That should never be the case. Another bill I introduced called the HAVEN Act, which is now law, shields those benefits in the same way that Social Security disability is exempted. No veteran should be penalized for receiving the disability compensation that they are rightly due.

Of course, perhaps the biggest headline news is our continued work on judicial nominations. Under this administration, we have confirmed more than 180 Federal judges, including 20 in Texas, plus 2 Supreme Court Justices. Although we are still 1 year shy of the end of President Trump's first term, we have already confirmed more circuit court judges than in any other President's first term in the past four decades. Having these impressive judges on the Federal bench will be a tremendous benefit to the entire country for generations to come, and we will keep working to confirm even more.

Over the last year, we have also built on our work to support victims of Hurricane Harvey, including the release of \$4.6 billion in additional funding from a bill to support communities across the country, including those in Texas, recovering from natural disasters.

More than 2 years after the storm, many Texans are still rebuilding and, sadly, have had the added struggle of fighting to get their hands on Federal funds already approved by Congress. In February 2018, Congress passed a funding package that included more than \$4 billion in disaster mitigation for Texas, but more than a year later, folks at home still hadn't seen a dime of that money.

This summer, I introduced a bill that would require the Office of Management and Budget to send those and any future funds approved by Congress within 90 days of their appropriation by Congress. Government bureaucrats should not be allowed to stand in the way between communities in need and funds already approved by Congress, and I am happy that those funds are finally going out the door to these Texas communities.

Another challenge we have faced over the last year is the ongoing crisis at the border, which hit its peak in May. Local communities in Texas helped carry the weight of this humanitarian crisis, which has placed serious strain on their ability to deliver basic services at the municipal and State levels. They diverted taxpayer dollars from things like public safety, power, and clean drinking water to do a job that should have been done by the Federal Government in the first place to secure our border.

To right this wrong, we passed a funding agreement, at my request, which provided \$30 million in reimbursements for local governments, States, and charitable organizations that have spent millions of dollars in response to this crisis, which seems to

be ignored too often here in Washington, DC. Nearly 40 percent of this initial funding went to Texas to meet immediate needs, and I expect another round to come soon to cover additional expenses.

Another big victory came in the form of international trade. Through my role as chairman of the Senate Finance Trade Subcommittee, I worked with the administration on three trade agreements with Japan, the USMCA—the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement—and China, all of which, I think, will inure to the benefit of all Americans, including Texans. I commend President Trump and Ambassador Lighthizer for their courage in confronting unfair trade practices, opening new markets, and providing economic certainty as we move into this election year.

On top of all of this, we passed the bipartisan Taxpayer First Act, which includes some of the most significant reforms to the Internal Revenue Service in two decades. We stood with victims of domestic violence and sexual assault by finally passing the Debbie Smith Reauthorization Act, which strengthens our fight to end the rape kit backlog. We helped provide additional resources to secure America's elections against foreign interference, and the list goes on and on and on.

It is safe to say, though, that there are a number of items that could have been added to this list of accomplishments, had they not been pulled into the political fray and this obsessive impeachment mania by the House of Representatives. Two things we could have done that were not accomplished as a result of this obsession were bills to reduce prescription drug pricing and to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act, for which the Presiding Officer has played such an important leadership role.

In both cases, there is broad bipartisan support for action, and in both cases, our colleagues on the other side of the aisle decided that political point scoring was more important than actually getting the job done; thus, we found ourselves at an impasse. As we gear up for a new year, those will be two of the top items on my priority list, and I hope our Democratic colleagues will work with us this time around to get them done.

We are kicking off 2020 with a big, looming question mark hanging over this Chamber in the form of this impeachment trial, which was an urgent constitutional imperative until it wasn't. We are anxious to see what Speaker PELOSI will finally decide, and we are waiting for the House to transmit the Articles of Impeachment, but we are not going to let the grass grow under our feet in the interim. We are going to keep working to notch more wins for the American people, confirm more Federal judges, and pass the USMCA trade agreement, hopefully, before further delay.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

(The remarks of Mr. HAWLEY pertaining to the introduction of S. Res. 463 are printed in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HAWLEY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

#### IRAN

Mr. KAINÉ. Madam President, I am glad to be joined today by my colleague from Illinois, who is a personal mentor of mine. We are here to talk about the threat of war with Iran and about the Constitution.

I have been worried about this threat for some time, ever since President Trump chose to ignore the advice of his key national security professionals and allies by abandoning America's commitment to a diplomatic deal to limit Iran's nuclear program. The President's action since that tragic decision and the easily predictable responses of Iran to his actions have resulted in an escalating set of hostilities between the United States and Iran and its proxies.

I will state at the outset my conclusion. I believe that the United States should not be at war in Iran and that, indeed, another war in the Middle East now would be catastrophic.

But I recognize that some of my colleagues may have a different point of view. So I speak in the hopes of forging a consensus on at least one issue, and that issue is this: If there is to be a war with Iran, it should not be initiated by this President or any President acting on his or her own. It should only be initiated by a vote of Congress following an open and public debate in full view of the American people.

Every Member of Congress should vote and then be accountable for the question of whether another war in the Middle East is a good idea. The demand for congressional accountability is constitutionally required in the unique constitutional framework that we have. We pledge to support and defend the principle that it is up to Congress to declare war, not the President.

If we engage in a war, the odds are high that young American men and women will be killed or injured. Some will see their friends killed and injured. Some will have the remainder of their lives affected by physical and emotional injuries, post-traumatic stress, the pain of losing friends, and their families and friends will bear those scars as well. If we are to order our troops and their families to run that risk, then, it should be based on a public consensus as reflected in an open congressional debate and vote that war is in the national interest.

If Congress debates the matter in full view of the public and reaches the conclusion that war is necessary, so be it. Even if I were to vote no, if the majority of my colleagues voted yes, I would agree that the decision to go to war was a legitimate basis to order our best and brightest into harm's way.

But by what right do we consign our troops to possible injury and death if



we are unwilling to have a debate and cast a vote ourselves? We cannot hide under our desks, outsource our constitutional duty to any President, and pretend that we can avoid accountability for war and its consequences.

Over the course of this week, I will address three topics about the issue of war with Iran. The first subject which I will address today is this: How did we get here? How did we come to the place where the United States and Iran are trading violent attacks against one another and what does that mean for our country, the region, and the world?

In the coming days, I will address two additional topics. I will discuss how Congress should reclaim its constitutional war-making powers by acting on a privileged resolution that Senator DURBIN and I have filed on January 3 to remove U.S. troops from hostilities with Iran unless Congress passes a new declaration or legal authorization initiating such a war. The resolution, which is also being offered on the House side by Representative SLOTKIN, will give all 535 Members of Congress the opportunity to declare where they are on the advisability of a war with Iran, and it also gives them an opportunity to affirm their commitment to their oath of office.

Finally, later in the week, I will address the larger question of how the United States should deescalate tensions in the Middle East so that we might better protect American lives and promote peace and stability in a very turbulent part of the world.

How did we get here?

The United States and Iran have a very troubled history. When Iran's democratically elected Prime Minister, Mohammad Mossaddegh, supported efforts to nationalize private energy resources, the United States and Britain orchestrated a coup that led to his ouster in 1953.

The overthrow of Iran's democratic government, partially with U.S. support, led to the strengthened rule of Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, who ruled Iran as an Emperor until he was overthrown in the Iranian revolution of 1979. His dictatorial rule, with strong support from the United States, increasingly alienated the Iranian population. When he fled the country during the revolution, Iran abolished the monarchy and declared itself an Islamic republic.

Within a few months after the revolution, Iranian protestors took over the American Embassy in Iran. For those of us who saw the protests outside the American Embassy in Baghdad last week, the images of the Iranian Embassy hostage taking in Iran in 1979 were at the front of our minds. The protesters cited America's role in the 1953 coups, and they asked the United States to return the Shah, who had come to the United States seeking medical attention, to Iran for trial. The United States refused. Iran held 52 Americans hostage for more than 440 days until they were finally released in

the first days of the Reagan administration.

After this attack—this inexcusable attack on the American Embassy—U.S. and Iran diplomatic relations were severed. The United States has imposed significant economic sanctions against Iran for decades. The United States provided support for Iraq in its 8-year war against Iran—a war in which hundreds of thousands of Iranians were killed.

In 1988, the U.S. Navy cruiser USS *Vincennes* shot down an Iranian commercial airliner, killing 290 passengers and its crew.

Iran has engaged in hostilities against the United States and our allies in many settings—through targeted attacks and assassinations around the world, covert and overt support for terrorist organizations, and development of weapons systems in violation of U.N. security resolutions. Iran has been directly responsible for the deaths of thousands of Americans and indirectly responsible for many, many more. These activities over many decades have led America for years to view Iran as a key promoter of terrorism and one of the most concerning nation-state adversaries of the United States.

In recent years, a particular focus has been Iran's nuclear program. Despite Iran's claim that it sought nuclear power purely for peaceful purposes, legitimate suspicion of its intent led to a global campaign led by the United States to sanction Iran even more as a means of getting the country to abandon its quest for nuclear weapons.

After years of negotiations between six nations—France, Britain, the United States, Germany, Russia, China—and Iran, an agreement was reached in 2015 whereby Iran would pledge never to seek, acquire, or develop nuclear weapons in exchange for gradual relaxation of sanctions against Iran. The agreement, known as the JCPOA, contained strict limits on Iran's nuclear program that would gradually relax over 25 years. Iran's pledge to never acquire or develop nuclear weapons was permanent, as was its commitment to abide by the inspection protocols of the International Atomic Energy Agency to ensure compliance with that fundamental pledge. The JCPOA was not perfect, but it carefully preserved the ability of the United States and other nations to continue sanctions against Iran for its other activities and offered an opportunity for the first time in four decades for the United States and Iran to communicate through an established diplomatic process.

As the Trump administration took office, the President pledged to undo this diplomatic deal, the JCPOA. The nations that agreed to the deal pointed out that Iran was complying with the deal, as did the IAEA, and the key officials of President Trump's national security team—Defense Secretary Mattis, Secretary of State Tillerson,

National Security Advisor McMaster, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Dunford—all argued that the agreement was working and should be maintained.

But President Trump made the decision that the United States should abandon the diplomatic deal. The U.S. abandonment of a working diplomatic deal was historic. No U.S. President had ever walked away from a diplomatic commitment of this kind.

Many of us, at the time, warned the President that abandoning diplomacy, against the advice of allies and our national security professionals, would likely lead us to an unnecessary war. It was just a matter of time. Indeed, since the beginning of the Trump administration, there have been increasing back-and-forth provocations that have now led us to a state of active hostilities between the United States and Iran.

Unclassified examples of U.S. activity under the Trump administration that have escalated hostilities with Iran include the following:

On December 12, 2017, the United States and Israel reached a joint strategic work plan to counter Iranian activity in the Middle East that included preparation for military escalation scenarios against Iran.

On May 8, 2018, President Trump unilaterally withdrew from the JCPOA after promising to do so for months.

On May 21, 2018, Secretary of State Pompeo, who had earlier expressed a preference for bombing Iran rather than entering into the JCPOA, vowed to “crush” Iranian operatives and proxies.

On July 23, 2018, President Trump tweeted a threat to President Rouhani, warning that Iran would “SUFFER CONSEQUENCES THE LIKES OF WHICH FEW THROUGHOUT HISTORY HAVE EVER SUFFERED BEFORE.”

On August 6, 2018, the Trump administration unilaterally imposed economic sanctions lifted as part of the JCPOA, despite Iran's continued compliance with the deal.

In September of 2018, it was reported that new National Security Advisor John Bolton had asked the Department of Defense to prepare war plans against Iran. Later the same month, Bolton warned Iran that there would be “hell to pay” if the nation ever crossed the United States.

On October 3, 2018, the Trump administration terminated the 1955 Treaty of Amity affirming friendly relations between the United States and Iran. The United States terminated it. The treaty itself had long ago been made irrelevant by the actual hostilities between the nations, but the action of the United States in finding the treaty and publicly terminating it unilaterally was seen as a part of a pattern of hostile intent.

As early as the fall of 2018, Department of Defense officials began to express concern that the U.S. maximum security pressure campaign against



Iran was raising the risk of Iranian retaliation against American troops in Iraq and Syria. In an October 26 article in the Wall Street Journal, DOD officials were quoted as expressing concern that Iran's belief that the United States was helping Israel with airstrikes would jeopardize American lives in the region.

On November 5, 2018, President Trump imposed additional sanctions on Iranian oil, shipping, and banking sectors.

On February 3, 2019, President Trump stated on "Face the Nation" that troops being withdrawn from Syria would be moved to Iraq to serve as a check against Iran.

On February 11, 2019, Advisor Bolton released a video addressed to the 40th anniversary of the Iranian revolution, stating that Iran's leaders would not "have many more anniversaries to enjoy."

On February 13, 2019, the Trump administration convened a meeting in Poland that was publicly described by Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu on his official website as designed to "advance the common interest of war" against Iran.

In March 2019, press accounts revealed that the Department of Energy had approved seven transfers of nuclear technical information from U.S. companies to Saudi Arabia without informing Congress. The transfers were made despite U.S. awareness that the Government of Saudi Arabia had publicly threatened to develop nuclear weapons to counter Iran.

On April 8, 2019, the United States designated the Iranian Revolutionary Guard as a foreign terrorist organization, the first time that had ever been used to apply to a foreign governmental entity.

On May 5, 2019, Advisor Bolton announced deployment of the Lincoln Carrier Strike Group and a bomber task force to the U.S. Central Command for the expressed purpose of countering Iran.

On May 8, 2019, the Trump administration ordered new sanctions against Iran's metal industry.

On May 10, 2019, the New York Times reported on war plans developed by the administration that could deploy up to 120,000 additional U.S. troops to the Middle East to counter Iran. On the same day, the administration deployed Patriot missiles to U.S. Central Command to counter Iran.

On May 24, 2019, the Trump administration bypassed Congress, declaring an emergency citing "Iranian malign activity" in order to sell weapons to Saudi Arabia and the UAE.

In June of 2019, President Trump ordered 3,500 more troops of the U.S. military to the Middle East to check Iran.

On June 20, 2019, the United States initiated a strike against Iranian positions that was aborted at the last minute by President Trump.

On June 24, 2019, President Trump imposed additional sanctions against Iran.

On September 15, 2019, after drone attacks on two key oil installations in Saudi Arabia, President Trump tweeted that the United States was "locked and loaded depending on verification from the Kingdom as to who they believe was the cause of the attack."

On November 19, 2019, President Trump notified Congress that "consistent with the War Powers Resolution," he was deploying additional U.S. weapons and troops to Saudi Arabia to counter Iran.

On December 29, 2019, following a rocket attack from an Iranian-backed militia in Iraq that killed an American contractor and wounded several others, the U.S. military struck Iranian-backed militia groups in Iraq and Syria, killing dozens.

On January 2, 2019, President Trump ordered a drone strike killing Qasem Soleimani, a key Iranian military commander as well as a key Iraqi military leader. The December and January strikes in Iraq were carried out despite the objections of the Iraqi Government and without any prior notification to Congress. Two days after the Soleimani strike, the President notified Congress of the action, which had been in the newspaper, obviously, "consistent with the War Powers Resolution."

Now, during the same time, Iran has conducted escalatory activities as well. Their bellicose behavior includes continued arming and financial backing of Hezbollah, a designated foreign terrorist organization which carried out the bombing of the marine barracks in Beirut as well as efforts to target Israeli citizens and troops; support for the Houthis, including the supplying of ballistic missiles, thus escalating the civil war in Yemen; direct participation of troops and commanders in support of Bashar al-Assad's murderous campaign against the Syrian people; support for the Popular Mobilization Committee-affiliated Shia militias in Iraq, which pose a direct threat to U.S. personnel; unjust detention of U.S. citizens; cyber attacks on U.S. officials, agencies, and companies; the downing of a U.S. unmanned aerial vehicle in June of 2019; UAV strikes against Saudi oil facilities in September 2019; persistent interference with commercial shipping in the Strait of Hormuz; militia attacks on the Iraqi base in December that killed an American contractor; and stoking popular unrest against the United States in Iraq that encouraged the assault on the U.S. Embassy in Baghdad last week.

I have given you these examples for a reason. You can see the reason. There has been an escalation that began with the U.S. decision to destroy a diplomatic deal, and it has been one nation acting and the other responding, and the other acting and the other responding, and now we are on the brink of war. The escalation has been so significant between the United States and Iran that now each country has been responsible for actively inflicting inju-

ries and deaths on the other, and we are at the brink of war.

Thousands of American servicemembers enjoying the holidays with their families were surprised by notices in the last few days that they must now deploy to the Middle East yet again. The current state of hostilities is causing other serious consequences.

The U.S. abandonment of the diplomatic deal, together with other actions, has seriously jeopardized our relations with many allies, particularly our European allies. The U.S. abandonment of a diplomatic deal over a nuclear program has made it much harder to find a diplomatic deal with North Korea. The U.S. decision to carry out strikes on Iraqi soil over Iraqi objections has badly damaged U.S.-Iraq relations. Just yesterday, the Iraqi Parliament voted to ask all U.S. troops to leave Iraq. If that occurs, it will further destabilize a country that has been wracked with protests in recent months, and it will embolden both ISIS and Iran.

U.S. actions have had the unlikely effect of driving three of our principled nation-state adversaries into historically unprecedented levels of cooperation. Just recently, Iran, China, and Russia conducted joint naval operations in the Gulf of Oman.

Notably, the U.S. actions that I have described here have been carried out mostly by President Trump without congressional approval and often without any notice or any consultation with Congress. Members of Congress on the relevant committees have had to read about these actions in the newspapers rather than being informed by the Trump administration.

At this particular moment, with the specter of war so present, it is time for Congress to assert itself. We cannot let a President destroy American diplomacy on its own. We cannot let a President take our Nation, take our troops, and take our best and brightest into an unnecessary war on his own. Indeed, we cannot leave the lives of our troops up to the whim of this President or of any President.

That is why Senator DURBIN and I have introduced, pursuant to the same War Powers Act referenced by the President, a resolution that will force the removal of U.S. troops from hostilities with Iran unless Congress independently votes that we should be at war. Congress has the responsibility, and Congress must act to shoulder its responsibility.

I will offer more comments on the resolution later this week, but I appreciate the support of my colleague, who, as I said, in many ways, is my mentor in the Senate, the Senator from Illinois.

I yield the floor to him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam President, I thank the Senator from Virginia for his clarion call for the U.S. Senate to assert its constitutional responsibility

when it comes to the prospect of a war with Iran.

He has referenced, many times, the War Powers Act. The War Powers Act, students of history will remember, was passed by the U.S. Congress after the end of the Vietnam war so Congress would assert, with specificity, its authority when it came to the execution of a war. The President at the time, Richard Nixon, opposed the War Powers Act and vetoed it, and because of what the United States had endured during the course of the Vietnam war, Congress overrode the veto of President Nixon to make it clear, with the War Powers Act, that we would never, by design, find ourselves in the same moral predicament we did with the war in Vietnam.

Almost 50,000 American lives were lost in that war in Vietnam, a war which was not a declared war under the Constitution but one which still exacted a heavy, incalculable price on American families—families I know and everyone knows, whose lives were touched by that Vietnam war, whose sons and daughters may have served or may have given their lives in service. The decision was made in Congress never again. We are not going to let this happen again. We are not going to find ourselves backsliding into a war.

The American people, through their elected men and women representing them in Congress, will make the decision as to whether it is time for us to go to war and will make the decision as to whether our men and women in uniform are going to risk their lives at war. The decision will be made by the American people through their elected representatives in Congress. It was not a novel idea. We find it in this little Constitution, which we are all handed when we take the oath of office.

As Senator KAINE from Virginia has noted, article I, section 8, in just a few words, says: The Congress shall have the power to declare war. It is not equivocal. There are no footnotes, asterisks, or question marks. The Congress shall have the authority to declare war.

Now, at this moment in time, with the assassination of General Soleimani and the escalation of the conflict between the United States and Iran, Senator KAINE and I come to the floor and ask this Congress, Republicans and Democrats alike: Do these words count? Do we have a constitutional responsibility to stand up and speak up and to challenge this President or any President of either political party when they start moving us toward a moment of war which could easily claim the lives of many Americans?

That is the purpose of our resolution. It is simple and straightforward, but it really goes to a fundamental question. The men and women who serve this country in uniform—God bless them for their sacrifice and their courage. We know that when they take the oath to serve, they are prepared to risk their lives in service. Many of us have

attended the funerals of servicemembers who gave their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan and so many other places. It is a heartbreaking experience to see that emotional family leaving a church or a synagogue after a service honoring someone in uniform who has given their life for this country. That is so fundamental.

Senator KAINE and I have come to the floor today to say we are finding ourselves now moving, day by day, closer and closer to a confrontation with Iran that could result in a war. What Senator KAINE has catalogued and gone through is this long buildup under the Trump administration that brings us to this moment.

To think President Trump inherited from President Obama an international agreement that included the signatories of not only our traditional European allies but also China and Russia to stop Iran from developing a nuclear weapon; to think that that agreement was being monitored by international overseers who reported back to us that they had ready access throughout the nation of Iran when it came to making certain that the JCPOA agreement was lived up to; to think that that at least gave us the assurance that Iran would not develop a nuclear weapon—and then this President, with a series of tweets and actions, swept it away and said we are going to ignore this treaty, we are going to walk away from it, and we are going to confront the Iranians in a variety of ways, as Senator KAINE has spelled out.

So we come to the floor this afternoon to really appeal to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. On behalf of the American people, let us learn the lessons of history—a lesson bitterly learned during the Vietnam war—that if Congress does nothing, a war can develop and continue at great human cost.

I know the moments of great decision that are made in the U.S. Congress, and I have been fortunate to be part of some of them. I remember October 16, 2002, as if it were yesterday. I remember that well, at that place that I point to, where in the early morning hours, three of us—three Senators stood and spoke to one another as we left to go home. There had just been a vote for an authorization for use of military force in Iraq. The three of us had gathered in the well, including Senator Paul Wellstone from Minnesota and Senator Kent Conrad from North Dakota, and we looked at one another, having all three voted against the invasion of Iraq, and realized we were headed home to face the electorate on that decision. It was an emotional moment.

I remember saying to Senator Wellstone, who had voted against the invasion of Iraq, as I had: Paul, I hope this doesn't cost you the election. He said: Dick, if it does, it is all right because that is what I was elected to do, to come here and to vote on issues. Is it possible there is any issue more important than the issue of asking Amer-

ican families to give their children in service of this country in a war?

Senator Wellstone passed away a few days later in an airplane crash. It was my last conversation with him, but I remember that moment, and I remember the responsibility we had. What Senator KAINE and I are doing now is to appeal to our colleagues on both sides of the aisle. Do not walk away from our responsibility when it comes to the future decision of whether we go to war with Iran. Stand up for those American families who sent us here to do our constitutional duty and engage in the debate as to whether it is the right thing at the right moment of history or whether it is an impulsive decision by a President who broke away from a political campaign meeting to authorize the assassination of General Soleimani and then returned to the campaign meeting. Make the decision as to whether this is the right moment in history. Don't point to the President that it is his responsibility; it is our responsibility. That is what this Constitution says.

(Mr. BOOZMAN assumed the Chair.)

Now, with that responsibility, we need to stand up and act. I am honored to join Senator KAINE. We have filed our resolution. We are seeking a ruling by the Parliamentarian, and we want to move forward on a schedule for a debate on the floor of the Senate. It may be the single most important debate we face this year for many years to come.

I yield the floor.

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the certificate of appointment to fill the vacancy created by the resignation of former Senator Johnny Isakson of Georgia. The certificate, the Chair is advised, is in the form suggested by the Senate. If there be no objection, the reading of the certificate will be waived, and it will be printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF GEORGIA

#### CERTIFICATE OF APPOINTMENT

*To the President of the Senate of the United States:*

This is to certify that, pursuant to the power vested in me by the Constitution of the United States and the laws of the State of Georgia, I, Brian Kemp, the Governor of said State, do hereby appoint Kelly Loeffler a Senator from said State to represent said State in the Senate of the United States until the vacancy therein caused by the resignation of John H. Isakson, is filled by election as provided by law.

Witness: His excellency our Governor Brian Kemp, and our seal hereto affixed at the Capitol, in the city of Atlanta, this 1st day of January, in the year of our Lord 2020.

By the Governor:

BRIAN P. KEMP,  
Governor.

BRAD RAFFENSPERGER,  
Secretary of State.

[State Seal Affixed]

## ADMINISTRATION OF OATH OF OFFICE

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the Senator-designate will now present herself at the desk, the Chair will administer the oath of office.

The Senator-elect, KELLY LOEFFLER, escorted by Ms. ERNST, advanced to the desk of the Vice President; the oath prescribed by law was administered to her by the Vice President; and she severally subscribed to the oath in the Official Oath Book.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Congratulations.

(Applause, Senators rising.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOOZMAN). The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

## NOMINATION OF JOVITA CARRANZA

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss the nomination of U.S. Treasurer Jovita Carranza to lead the Small Business Administration. Treasurer Carranza's nomination comes at a time of great change for American small businesses. With the growing diversity in America, the face of business ownership in America is naturally also becoming more diverse.

I have witnessed these changes firsthand in my home State of Maryland, which currently boasts the highest concentration of women-owned businesses in the country, as well as the highest concentration of minority-owned businesses. Maryland's success has been no accident; it is as a result of our leaders' decades-long commitment to creating opportunities for underserved entrepreneurs, which began when the late Baltimore Congressman Parren J. Mitchell created the first Federal set-aside for minority contractors in 1977.

It was with this understanding that I requested a seat on the Small Business Committee when I joined this body in 2006, and it is with this understanding that I am hopeful that Treasurer Carranza will provide much needed leadership at the SBA and serve as an advocate for entrepreneurs—especially those from underserved communities—within the administration.

If confirmed to lead the SBA, Treasurer Carranza will enter an agency that has not had a Deputy Administrator since April 2018 and that has been led by its General Counsel since former Administrator Linda McMahon resigned in April 2019. She will join an administration that has pushed for drastic cuts at the SBA in every budget it has sent to Congress. I am grateful that our Appropriations Committee has consistently rejected the administration's devastating budget proposals, and I hope that Treasurer Carranza will work to ensure that the administration's fiscal year 2021 budget is not more of the same.

Minorities, women, veterans, and entrepreneurs from other underserved communities face specific, historical barriers to business ownership, and they need an SBA that has the leader-

ship, vision, and tools required to meet their needs. I would like to use this opportunity to highlight what I believe are the two most critical areas where the SBA is falling short in its support of underserved communities.

First, SBA must do a better job of providing affordable capital to entrepreneurs from underserved communities.

SBA's various loan programs provide entrepreneurs with affordable capital to fund their businesses. These loans are especially important for underserved entrepreneurs, who typically have less wealth with which to fund a small business and have lower rates of business loan approvals.

Instead of filling in the gaps in the credit markets, SBA's highest volume loan program, the 7(a) Program, has mirrored the inequities in the market. That is something we need to address. Addressing this issue is important not only in Maryland, which, as I mentioned, has one of the most diverse small business communities in the country, it is vital for the future health of America's economy, considering that women and minorities are driving growth in new business formation.

According to a recent American Express study, the overall business ownership rate increased only 9 percent between 2014 and 2019. Over the same 5-year period, the number of women-owned businesses increased 21 percent—more than twice as fast as the overall rate—and the number of minority women-owned businesses grew by 43 percent.

It is clear that the underserved communities are driving the growth and business formation in America, and SBA's loan programs must catch up to this new reality.

Second, SBA must do all it can to increase opportunity for small business contractors. Recent trends paint an onerous picture of the future of small business contracting. A 2019 Bloomberg Government report found that despite a steady increase in government spending in the past several years, the Federal contracting marketplace is becoming less competitive, with the number of contractors working on unclassified contracts at a 10-year low. Small businesses are facing the brunt of this decrease, which is particularly troubling in Maryland, where Federal contracting accounted for 8 percent—roughly \$33 billion—of our State's GDP in 2018. The jobs created by these companies have helped thousands of families in Maryland enter the middle class.

The Senate has taken steps to help small contractors. I am proud to share that today SBA will begin implementing the Runway Extension Act—legislation I introduced that will allow small businesses to make critical investments to grow their businesses without fearing they will lose access to resources and Federal contracting opportunities.

But Congress alone cannot reverse the increasing insularity of the Federal contracting process; SBA must work with large agencies that are driving these trends in Federal contracting to ensure that small businesses are given opportunities to become prime contractors and supply the Federal Government.

Treasurer Carranza's prior experience should serve her well at the SBA. In nearly 30 years at UPS, where she began as a part-time package handler, Treasurer Carranza became the highest ranking Latina in the history of the company. She also served in government as Deputy Administrator of SBA under President George W. Bush, during which she chaired the SBA's Office of Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization Council.

At a time when America's small businesses are experiencing rapid demographic changes and new challenges, SBA needs bold and innovative leadership. I am optimistic that Treasurer Carranza can be the leader and advocate that SBA and American small businesses need right now. I support her nomination. I urge my colleagues to approve her nomination as the SBA Administrator.

With that, I yield the floor.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION—Continued

## CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

## CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration.

Mitch McConnell, John Boozman, Joni Ernst, Kevin Cramer, David Perdue, Steve Daines, Thom Tillis, Roger F. Wicker, James E. Risch, Cindy Hyde-Smith, Lisa Murkowski, Pat Roberts, Richard C. Shelby, Deb Fischer, James Lankford, Chuck Grassley, Mike Rounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Jovita Carranza, of Illinois, to be Administrator of the Small Business Administration, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER), the Senator from Utah (Mr. LEE), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE).

Further, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. ALEXANDER) would have voted "yea."

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER), the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mrs. SHAHEEN), and the Senator from Massachusetts (Ms. WARREN) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 86, nays 5, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote 1 Ex.]

YEAS—86

Baldwin	Feinstein	Peters
Barrasso	Fischer	Portman
Bennet	Gardner	Reed
Blackburn	Graham	Risch
Blumenthal	Grassley	Roberts
Blunt	Hassan	Romney
Boozman	Hawley	Rosen
Braun	Heinrich	Rounds
Brown	Hirono	Rubio
Burr	Hoeven	Sasse
Cantwell	Hyde-Smith	Schumer
Capito	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cardin	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Carper	Jones	Shelby
Casey	Kaine	Sinema
Cassidy	Kennedy	Smith
Collins	King	Stabenow
Coons	Lankford	Stabenow
Cornyn	Leahy	Sullivan
Cortez Masto	Loeffler	Tester
Cotton	Manchin	Thune
Cramer	McConnell	Tillis
Crapo	McSally	Toomey
Cruz	Menendez	Udall
Daines	Moran	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murkowski	Warner
Durbin	Murphy	Whitehouse
Enzi	Murray	Wicker
Ernst	Paul	Young

NAYS—5

Gillibrand	Merkley	Wyden
Harris	Schatz	

NOT VOTING—9

Alexander	Lee	Sanders
Booker	Markey	Shaheen
Klobuchar	Perdue	Warren

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 86, the nays are 5.

The motion is agreed to.

The Senator from Ohio.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA  
TRADE AGREEMENT

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise to talk about an issue that the Senate may address on the floor this week.

Tomorrow in the Senate Finance Committee, we are going to take up the renegotiated North American Free Trade Agreement.

One of my proudest votes as a Member of the House a long time ago was to vote against the North American Free Trade Agreement, to vote against NAFTA. I have voted no on every trade agreement since then because every trade agreement that has come in front of this body was written by corporate interests for their corporate executives and stockholders. They maximize profits always—every one of these trade agreements—CAFTA, NAFTA, PNTR with China, which is not technically a trade agreement, but it quacks like a duck and walks like a duck. Every one of these trade agreements, in every

case, has looked out for corporate interests and jettisoned the interests of workers.

We see the consequences. Corporate profits soar every time. Executive compensation explodes upward every time. Workers continue to produce more than ever before. Even though corporate profits are up and executive compensation is up, workers' wages are flat. Often, they can't join a union, and the middle class continues to shrink.

I know what that has meant in the Presiding Officer's State of Arkansas. I know what it has meant in Ohio. I know what it has done to my hometown of Mansfield. I know what these trade agreements do to Dayton and Cleveland and Cincinnati and Canton and Youngstown and Toledo.

Then-Candidate Trump said that he was going to renegotiate NAFTA. Well, that was his promise. He did, but he gave us the same thing. His economic policies overall have been that, but his renegotiated NAFTA, which he brought to this Congress originally—the negotiation that he made with Mexico and Canada—was another corporate trade agreement written for corporate interests.

Again, this President betrays workers with his tax giveaways to corporations, to his judges who put their thumbs on the scale, choosing corporations over workers, choosing Wall Street over consumers.

Then, last year, as he has done one betrayal of workers after another, squeezing the middle class even more—last year, when we got the initial draft of this agreement from the administration, the renegotiated NAFTA was another betrayal.

His first NAFTA draft was nowhere near the good deal for workers that President Trump promised. He had fundamentally negotiated another corporate trade deal—a deal that helps corporate executives, that helps stockholders, that betrays workers again and again, another trade deal just like that. It meant nothing for workers. It meant a sellout to drug companies. It took us months of fighting alongside Speaker PELOSI and Senator WYDEN and trade unions to improve this deal and take the real and important steps toward putting workers at the center of our trade policies.

These trade policies should be written for workers so that they increase their income and expand the middle class, not written for corporations in trickle-down economics. We know what happens on every tax bill that comes before this Congress, written by the administration and Senator MCCONNELL. We know it is the same thing. Instead of building the economy from the middle out so that the middle class grows and America overwhelmingly prospers, just like the tax cuts—the tax cuts for the rich that may, they tell us, trickle down and help the middle class—that is the way this trade agreement was written. That is the way these tax bills in this Congress were written.

It took months of fighting alongside Senator WYDEN and organized labor and Speaker PELOSI. We now have a provision in the labor chapter, and the President has finally agreed to this provision. He knew he wasn't going to get a renegotiated NAFTA unless he followed what we said on workers. For the first time, we have a provision in the labor chapter.

For instance, it says that violence against workers is always a violation of the agreement. The language the President gave us said: Well, the first time you commit violence against workers, we might fine you. The second time, we might fine you. Only if you do it over and over is it a violation. Really? If there is violence against workers, the people who committed that violence ought to pay for it. So we fixed that in this agreement.

We have improved some of the legalese that since the beginning has been included in trade agreements to make it nearly impossible to successfully win a case when a country violates its labor commitments.

We secured the Wyden provision, which amounts to, by far, the strongest ever labor enforcement in the U.S. trade deal. This provision that Senator WYDEN and I wrote and fought for is the first improvement to enforcing labor standards in our trade agreements since we have been negotiating them.

We know why companies closed factories in Ohio and opened them in Mexico. They can pay lower wages. They can take advantage of workers who don't have rights. They can keep unions from organizing. American workers can't compete with that kind of low-wage lack of enforcement of labor laws. What happens? There is a race to the bottom on wages. So if a company threatens to move to Mexico and they tell their workforce "We are going to move unless you do some wage givebacks," they either move and the American workers lose their jobs or they use that as a way to put downward pressure on wages for American workers.

I know what that has done to Mansfield, OH. I know what it has done to Gallipolis, Chillicothe, Zanesville, Dayton, Huber Heights, and every other community. The only way to stop this is by raising labor standards in every country we trade with and, most importantly, making sure those standards are actually enforced. If corporations are forced to pay workers a living wage and treat them with dignity no matter where the workers are, we take away the incentive for those companies to move jobs abroad. That is what the Brown-Wyden provision does.

A worker in Mexico now, under this agreement—the reason I am supporting this, the first-ever trade agreement that I am supporting—workers in Mexico will be able to report a company that is violating their rights. They can actually call a toll-free number and report violations against the workers. A

worker can actually make that request. They have never had that right in Mexico. They, often enough, don't have it here. We can then determine whether worker rights have been violated and then take action against the company that did it. We have never done it that way. We haven't had good results because of that.

We can apply punitive damages when companies stop workers from organizing. If they keep doing it, we stop their goods from coming into the United States. You enforce it at the factory level by saying: If you keep violating this trade agreement, you are not sending your products into the United States. That will make them behave.

When Mexican workers have the power to form real unions and negotiate for higher wages, it helps our workers. Right now, Mexican workers can be paid as little as \$6.50—not an hour but a day. We have been asking American workers to compete with that. We have already heard some critics say that Brown-Wyden will force Mexican wages to rise. I plead guilty. That is the entire point—to take away the incentive. If Mexican wages go up, it makes U.S. companies less likely to shut down production in Steubenville or Lisbon or in Bryan, OH, and move overseas. It takes away the incentive for those companies to relocate.

I want to be clear. I will always be straight with American workers. This is not a perfect agreement. One trade deal that Democrats fixed will not undo the rest of Trump's economic policies that put corporations over workers.

This deal will not stop outsourcing when we have President Trump's tax plan that gives companies a tax break to send American jobs to Mexico. Here is how the President's tax bill that was rammed through this Senate a year or so ago works: If you are in Springfield, OH, your corporate tax rate is 21 percent. If you move—pull up stakes and move to Mexico or anywhere else—your tax rate is 10.5 percent. Even with this good trade agreement, we cannot stop that kind of outsourcing because the President insists on helping his corporate buddies.

I will keep fighting his corporate trade policies and tax policies just as we did in this agreement. We have a lot more work to do to make our trade agreements more pro-worker.

I will vote yes for the first time ever on a trade agreement because, by including Brown-Wyden, Democrats have made this agreement much more pro-worker. We set an important precedent for the future that Brown-Wyden must now be included in every trade agreement in the years ahead.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Without objection, it is so ordered.

## LEGISLATIVE SESSION

### MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session for a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

#### REMEMBERING ALFRED J. RIOUX

• Mr. BLUMENTHAL. Mr. President, I rise today with a heavy heart to pay tribute to Alfred J. Rioux, a dedicated public servant, advocate, and friend to many. Sadly, Mr. Rioux passed away on November 9, 2019, at the age of 85. He will be remembered for his commitment to Connecticut and his jovial spirit.

Born in Hartford, CT, Al served in the Navy as a seaman 2nd class and deep-sea diver on the USS *Skylark* during the Korean war. Once discharged, he started an apprenticeship in Hartford for the Arrow-Hart Hegeman Company as a tool and die engineer.

Upon moving to Newington, CT, with his family, Al began working in real estate and insurance. At the same time, he became a member of the Connecticut Home Builders Association, helping to develop single-family homes in his town. This initial involvement in Newington would serve as the catalyst for Al's lifelong devotion to Connecticut politics.

In the 1970s and 1980s, some of Al's pivotal roles included helping Bill Catter successfully win his first term in the U.S. House of Representatives, serving as an aide to Congressman Catter, a 15-year position as the Newington Democratic Party's Town chairman, and attending the 1980 Democratic National Convention as a delegate in support of President Jimmy Carter. He also served two terms as the sheriff of Hartford County.

Al gave back to his communities outside of politics, as well. In one of the first kidney transplants performed at Hartford Hospital through Dr. Robert Schweitzer and Dr. Stanley Bartus's transplant program, Al received a kidney from his sister, Dorothy Williams, in 1975. This successful operation led him to organize the Connecticut Kidney Research Fund Golf Tournament. Throughout its many years, the tournament helped raise hundreds of thousands of dollars in support of Hartford Hospital's kidney transplant research.

Through his involvement in Connecticut politics, transplant advocacy, and numerous organizations, Al left a

lasting impression on everyone around him thanks to his zeal for life and readiness to help others.

My wife Cynthia and I extend our deepest sympathies to Al's family during this difficult time, particularly to his wife Elma and his many children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren. May their many wonderful memories of Al provide them solace and comfort.●

### RECOGNIZING ALL AMERICAN BEEF BATTALION

• Mr. GARDNER. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the commendable actions of the group known as All American Beef Battalion, which provided an immeasurable service to our veterans, active servicemembers, and their families at Fort Carson in Colorado Springs, CO, on Veterans Day.

Bill Broadie, a veteran who was injured during the Vietnam war, was dismayed to find on his return home that anti-war protesters were not just opposed to the conflict, but actively directed their ire at troops returning from the war. After the events of September 11, 2001, Broadie—now a cattleman in Kansas—wanted to provide a service that showed the troops about to deploy into war that their service would not go unappreciated. In 2008, the All American Beef Battalion was born.

Broadie utilized his cowboy instincts to come up with an innovative way to show the appreciation he and so many American men and women feel toward these brave servicemembers: a ribeye steak dinner for the servicemembers and their loved ones. With that purpose, the volunteers at the All American Beef Battalion have served over 400,000 people across 26 States, including my home State of Colorado, where they have hosted these dinners at least 10 times.

On November 10, 2019, they served 150 veterans and their families at the Fraternal Order of Eagles No. 143 in Colorado Springs, CO. This provided a wonderful way for these men and women to celebrate our Nation's 101st Veterans Day and, as a special treat for the former U.S. Marines present there, the 244th birthday of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Our country's military servicemembers, both veterans and Active Duty, sacrifice so much in defense of our freedoms. I am so pleased that the All American Beef Battalion has found a unique way to show these brave men and women how much we appreciate their service.●

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Ms. Roberts, one of his secretaries.

### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages

from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The messages received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communication was laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and was referred as indicated:

EC-3588. A communication from the President of the United States to the President Pro Tempore of the United States Senate, transmitting, consistent with the War Powers Act, a report relative to deployment of additional United States Armed Forces to the United States Central Command area of responsibility, received during adjournment of the Senate on January 4, 2020 (OSS-2020-0003); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, without amendment:

S. 51. A bill to extend the Federal recognition to the Little Shell Tribe of Chippewa Indians of Montana, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-190).

By Mr. HOEVEN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

H.R. 317. A bill to reaffirm the action of the Secretary of the Interior to take land into trust for the benefit of the Santa Ynez Band of Chumash Mission Indians, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-191).

By Mr. JOHNSON, from the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs, with amendments:

S. 2749. A bill to provide requirements for the .gov domain, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-192).

S. 2779. A bill to establish the Federal Clearinghouse on School Safety Best Practices, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-193).

By Mr. WICKER, from the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

Report to accompany S. 1694. A bill to require any Federal agency that issues licenses to conduct lunar activities to include in the requirements for such licenses an agreement relating to the preservation and protection of the Apollo 11 landing site, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 116-194).

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 3149. A bill to provide for a Federal partnership to ensure educational equity and quality; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3150. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COTTON, Ms. ERNST, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. INHOFE):

S. Res. 463. A resolution amending the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

By Mr. MCCONNELL:

S. Res. 464. A resolution to constitute the majority party's membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen; considered and agreed to.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 227

At the request of Ms. CORTEZ MASTO, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 227, a bill to direct the Attorney General to review, revise, and develop law enforcement and justice protocols appropriate to address missing and murdered Indians, and for other purposes.

S. 652

At the request of Mr. PORTMAN, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 652, a bill to require the United States Postal Service to continue selling the Multinational Species Conservation Funds Semipostal Stamp until all remaining stamps are sold, and for other purposes.

S. 851

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. BENNET) was added as a cosponsor of S. 851, a bill to direct the Secretary of Labor to issue an occupational safety and health standard that requires covered employers within the health care and social service industries to develop and implement a comprehensive workplace violence prevention plan, and for other purposes.

S. 1084

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the names of the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1084, a bill to prohibit the usage of exploitative and deceptive practices by large online operators and to promote consumer welfare in the use of behavioral research by such providers.

S. 1153

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1153, a bill to explicitly make unauthorized access to Department of Education information technology systems and the misuse of identification devices issued by the Department of Education a criminal act.

S. 1458

At the request of Ms. HARRIS, the name of the Senator from Maine (Mr.

KING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1458, a bill to codify the Outdoor Recreation Legacy Partnership Program of the National Park Service, and for other purposes.

S. 1700

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1700, a bill to provide a temporary safe harbor for publishers of online content to collectively negotiate with dominant online platforms regarding the terms on which content may be distributed.

S. 1772

At the request of Mr. YOUNG, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. PERDUE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1772, a bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes.

S. 1989

At the request of Mr. SCOTT of South Carolina, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1989, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for transparency of Medicare secondary payer reporting information, and for other purposes.

S. 2185

At the request of Mr. MERKLEY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2185, a bill to provide labor standards for certain energy jobs, and for other purposes.

S. 2507

At the request of Mr. RUBIO, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Ms. SINEMA) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2507, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to authorize admission of Canadian retirees as long-term visitors for pleasure described in section 101(a)(15)(B) of such Act, and for other purposes.

S. 2561

At the request of Mr. BLUMENTHAL, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. BURR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2561, a bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to clarify provisions enacted by the Captive Wildlife Safety Act, to further the conservation of certain wildlife species, and for other purposes.

S. 2599

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the names of the Senator from Maine (Ms. COLLINS) and the Senator from New York (Mrs. GILLIBRAND) were added as cosponsors of S. 2599, a bill to amend the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 to provide assistance to manage farmer and rancher stress and for the mental health of individuals in rural areas, and for other purposes.

S. 2661

At the request of Ms. BALDWIN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. BLUMENTHAL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2661, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to designate 9-8-8 as the universal telephone



number for the purpose of the national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system operating through the National Suicide Prevention Lifeline and through the Veterans Crisis Line, and for other purposes.

S. 2733

At the request of Mr. ROMNEY, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2733, a bill to save and strengthen critical social contract programs of the Federal Government.

S. 2999

At the request of Mr. CASSIDY, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARDNER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2999, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals with direct primary care service arrangements to remain eligible individuals for purposes of health savings accounts.

S. 3011

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3011, a bill to authorize demonstration projects to improve educational and housing outcomes for children.

S. RES. 462

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 462, a resolution designating January 2020 as "National One Health Awareness Month" to promote awareness of organizations focused on public health, animal health, and environmental health collaboration throughout the United States and to recognize the critical contributions of those organizations to the future of the United States.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself and Ms. CANTWELL):

S. 3150. A bill to establish a pilot program for native plant species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Native Plant Species Pilot Program Act. I am pleased to be partnering with Senator CANTWELL on this initiative. Our bipartisan bill supports a new pilot program at the National Park Service (NPS) to support the use of native plants. This legislation also encourages the Park Service to review existing data and study the cost-effectiveness of using native plants.

Native plants are species found naturally in regions and can provide valuable functions to our National Park System. Benefits range from using less water and pesticides, purifying the air, and recharging groundwater in wetlands. By using native species, the Park Service can also improve habitat for wildlife and restore important spe-

cies of birds and butterflies to their natural habitat.

In Acadia National Park, native plants are an important part of the ongoing conservation work. I commend Superintendent Kevin Schneider and all those who work on these issues at the park for their work to encourage the use of native plants. Acadia National Park protects more than 900 plant species, including some that are globally, nationally, and locally rare.

Native plants, however, face many threats such as non-native pests, non-native plants, diseases, and a changing climate. Today, almost one quarter of Acadia National Park's species are non-native to the park. The tree species of Acadia, the red spruce, is projected to lose a substantial amount of its habitat in coming decades as a result of climate change. In addition, invasive pests, such as Emerald Ash Borer and the hemlock woolly adelgid are impacting northern forests, and the emerald ash borer has already been identified in Maine.

This bill will ensure that we preserve Maine's cultural history and natural heritage. Acadia's native plant communities includes many iconic species such as the blueberry barrens near the mountain summits, the towering white pines in older forests, and the cranberry bogs along Northeast Creek that contribute to Maine's iconic landscape. Other native plants in Maine are the wildflowers that bloom in August and September, such as asters and golden-rods, helping to attract the more than 3.5 million visitors a year to one of the seventh most-visited national parks in the United States.

I am pleased to report that our bipartisan bill has earned the support of the Garden Club of America, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation to help protect the natural landscapes at our national parks and keep native plants thriving for years to come.

Thank you, Mr. President.

#### SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 464—TO CONSTITUTE THE MAJORITY PARTY'S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN

Mr. MCCONNELL submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 464

*Resolved*, That the following shall constitute the majority party's membership on the following committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, NUTRITION, AND FORESTRY: Mr. Roberts, Mr. McConnell, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Hoeven, Ms. Ernst, Mrs. Hyde-Smith, Mr. Braun, Mr. Grassley, Mr. Thune, Mrs. Fischer, Mrs. Loeffler.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE: Mr. Grassley, Mr. Crapo, Mr. Roberts, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Cornyn,

Mr. Thune, Mr. Burr, Mr. Portman, Mr. Toomey, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Lankford, Mr. Daines, Mr. Young, Mr. Sasse.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS: Mr. Risch, Mr. Rubio, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Gardner, Mr. Romney, Mr. Graham, Mr. Barrasso, Mr. Portman, Mr. Paul, Mr. Young, Mr. Cruz, Mr. Perdue.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR, AND PENSIONS: Mr. Alexander, Mr. Enzi, Mr. Burr, Mr. Paul, Ms. Collins, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Roberts, Ms. Murkowski, Mr. Scott (SC), Mr. Romney, Mr. Braun, Mrs. Loeffler.

JOINT ECONOMIC COMMITTEE: Mr. Lee, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Portman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Cruz, Mrs. Loeffler.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS: Mr. Moran, Mr. Boozman, Mr. Cassidy, Mr. Rounds, Mr. Tillis, Mr. Sullivan, Mrs. Blackburn, Mr. Cramer, Mrs. Loeffler.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 463—AMENDING THE RULES OF PROCEDURE AND PRACTICE IN THE SENATE WHEN SITTING ON IMPEACHMENT TRIALS

Mr. HAWLEY (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Florida, Mr. BRAUN, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. CRUZ, Mr. DAINES, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. COTTON, Ms. ERNST, Mr. PERDUE, and Mr. INHOFE) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. RES. 463

*Resolved*, That rule I of the Rules of Procedure and Practice in the Senate When Sitting on Impeachment Trials is amended to read as follows:

"I. Whenever the Senate shall receive notice from the House of Representatives that managers are appointed on their part to conduct an impeachment against any person and are directed to carry articles of impeachment to the Senate, the Secretary of the Senate shall immediately inform the House of Representatives that the Senate is ready to receive the managers for the purpose of exhibiting such articles of impeachment, agreeably to such notice. If, following adoption of such articles, the House of Representatives does not so notify the Senate or otherwise provide for such articles to be exhibited to the Senate within 25 calendar days from the date of adoption of such articles, as recorded in the Journal of the House of Representatives, such articles shall be deemed exhibited before the Senate and it shall be in order for any Senator to offer a motion to dismiss such articles with prejudice for failure by the House of Representatives to prosecute such articles. Such motion shall be adopted by an affirmative vote of a majority of the Senators, duly chosen and sworn, without debate by the yeas and nays, which shall be entered on the record."

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, it has been 19 days today—19 days—since the House of Representatives impeached the President of the United States. It has been 19 days since we were told that it was urgent that President Trump be impeached and removed from office. It was urgent for the safety of the country. It was urgent for national security. It was urgent to protect the Constitution of the United States. It was urgent; it had to be done now. The articles had to be rushed through. The rules had to be violated. There couldn't be due process. It was urgent.

Where are we now? Nineteen days later, the Speaker of the House has



still not transmitted the articles to this body for a trial, has still not appointed managers for a trial, has still not exhibited the articles before this body for a trial.

We now have the longest delay in American history in providing notice to this body and actually moving forward with a trial, and now I think we have a better sense of what was urgent. What was urgent was fulfilling the partisan vendetta that the Speaker of the House and the Democrats have against this President. What was urgent was overturning the results of an election that they have never accepted. That is what was urgent.

But now—now that it is time to actually try the case—well, now the Speaker and the Democrats aren't so sure. In fact, now they don't seem to want a trial. Now, when it is time to put up or shut up, actually put the evidence forward to be judged, Speaker PELOSI is saying that she may withhold the articles indefinitely and prevent this body indefinitely from carrying out its constitutional responsibilities—after, of course, a bipartisan coalition in the House of Representatives voted against impeachment.

I think we can probably see, the longer we wait, why the Speaker is so reluctant now to have a trial. It was a purely partisan process in the House. She had Democrats abandon her and vote with Republicans in a bipartisan coalition against impeachment. The articles don't even allege a crime. This was the first time in American history in the impeachment of a President in which no crime was even alleged in the articles, no evidence of a crime even presented. No wonder she doesn't want to have a trial. No wonder she is now sitting on the articles and will not permit a Senate trial to begin.

Well, here is the problem with that: The Constitution of the United States is really clear. The House has the power to impeach. They have done that. But the Senate—and the Senate alone—has the power to try.

The Constitution, article I, says that the Senate has the sole power to try impeachment cases, to adjudicate what has happened in the House, to examine the facts, and to render a judgment of some sort. Now the House Speaker is attempting to prevent the Senate from carrying out its constitutional responsibilities, its constitutional prerogative.

All of this division and rancor—all of this bitterness that she has put the country through now for months on end—she apparently wants to continue indefinitely and deny this body its constitutional responsibility to conduct a trial.

It has been 19 days. It could be 90 days. It could be 190 days. There is nothing that will stop the Speaker from sitting on these articles indefinitely. They could persist into the President's second term, if and when he is reelected. That is the situation we are now facing.

If Americans are sick of this impeachment saga, this partisan circus now, just wait until we are still sitting here in October or January of next year or January of the year following or who knows when without a trial, without adjudication, without any resolution. That is why it is time for this body to act.

It is time for the Senate to act to preserve the Constitution's separation of powers, to preserve the Constitution's guarantees—the right to due process, the right for the President to be heard, the right for the American people to have these Articles of Impeachment adjudicated, resolved, as the Constitution commits to and provides for. That is why today I am introducing a resolution to update the Senate's rules to account for this unprecedented attempt by the Speaker of the House to delay, to deny, to obstruct a trial in the U.S. Senate.

Let's be clear. This has never been done before. It has not even been thought of before. Nobody had thought, before Speaker PELOSI launched this gambit 19 days ago, that the House could sit on Articles of Impeachment indefinitely in order to stop a Senate trial.

If the Constitution is going to remain in effect, if the Senate is going to have the power, as the Constitution provides, to try cases, if the President is going to get his day in court, if the American people are going to have the ability to have this issue resolved, to see the facts, to get a verdict, the Senate has to act.

Today I am proposing new rules in the U.S. Senate that will set a time limit on the actions of the House. It will give the House Speaker 25 days from the date that the articles are adopted and published to transmit those articles here to the Senate, to exhibit them as the House rules and Senate rules currently speak of and anticipate, and if that is not done, if in 25 days the House Speaker has not acted so that the Senate is able to move forward with a trial, then, under my resolution and the change in the rules that I propose today, the Senate would be able to introduce a motion to dismiss these articles for lack of prosecution.

In the real world, when a prosecutor brings a case but refuses to try it, the court has the ability and the defendant has the right—a constitutional right, I might add—to have those indictments, those charges, dismissed. That is precisely the action that I am proposing today.

It is time to update the Senate's rules to account for this unprecedented attempt at obstruction, at denial, at delay. It is time for the Senate to act.

The House has a simple choice in front of it—or it should. That choice is to send the Articles of Impeachment to this body to be tried before this body, to exhibit the evidence that it has to make the case that it can, however poor that case may be, but to make the case that it can and to allow the Amer-

ican people the right to have this resolution achieved, the right to have the evidence tried, the right to have the verdict rendered.

It is time for the Senate to act to ensure that the constitutional balance of power, the constitutional separation of powers, and the basic functioning of this government of our Republic are able to go forward. This is a matter of great urgency. There is nothing more serious than an attempt to overturn the results of a democratic election and to remove from office a sitting President, and that is exactly what is happening now.

It is imperative that we act. The country deserves it. It is imperative for future Congresses and for the future of the country that the Constitution not be subverted in this rush by Speaker PELOSI and House Democrats to remove this President from office without evidence, on no basis, and solely for political purposes. We must defend the Constitution, and we must act now to do so.

#### RELEASING A FEDERAL REVERSIONARY INTEREST IN CHESTER COUNTY, TENNESSEE

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 377, S. 3076.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3076) to release a federal reversionary interest in Chester County, Tennessee, to manage certain Federal land in Bath County, Virginia, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I further ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 3076) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed as follows:

S. 3076

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. CHESTER COUNTY REVERSIONARY INTEREST RELEASE.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(2) STATE.—The term “State” means the State of Tennessee.

(3) STATE FOREST LAND.—The term “State forest land” means the approximately 0.62-acre parcel of land in Chickasaw State Forest that is identified as “State Forest Land” on the map prepared by the Forest Service entitled “State Forest Land Detail Map” and dated December 13, 2019.

(4) WEBB PROPERTY.—The term “Webb property” means the approximately 0.90-acre parcel of land owned by Kirby and Leta Webb

identified as “Webb Property Lot 1” on the map entitled “Webb Property Detail Map” and dated December 13, 2019.

(b) RELEASE OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—

(1) RELEASE.—On the transfer of ownership of the Webb property to the State for inclusion in the Chickasaw State Forest and the transfer of the State forest land to the State or a non-State entity, by request of the State, the Secretary shall release to the State, without consideration, the reversionary interest of the United States in and to the State forest land described in paragraph (2).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF REVERSIONARY INTEREST.—The reversionary interest referred to in paragraph (1) is the reversionary interest of the United States in and to the State forest land that—

(A) requires that the State forest land be used for public purposes; and

(B) is contained in a deed—

(i) granting from the United States to the State the State forest land;

(ii) dated August 12, 1955; and

(iii) registered on pages 588 through 591 of book 48 of the record of deeds for Chester County, Tennessee.

(c) SALE OF MINERAL RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any valid existing rights of third parties, as soon as practicable after the date on which all actions described in subsection (b)(1) have been carried out, the Secretary shall offer to sell to the State the undivided mineral interests of the United States in and to the State forest land.

(2) TERMS OF SALE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall determine—

(i) the mineral character of the State forest land; and

(ii) the market value of the mineral interests referred to in paragraph (1), as determined by an appraisal conducted in accordance with subparagraph (C).

(B) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—As a condition of any sale under this subsection, the State shall pay to the United States—

(i) any administrative costs incurred by the United States in selling to the State the mineral interests referred to in paragraph (1), including the costs incurred by the Secretary in making the determinations required under subparagraph (A); and

(ii) an amount equal to the market value of the mineral interests referred to in paragraph (1), as determined under subparagraph (A)(ii).

(C) APPRAISAL REQUIREMENTS.—An appraisal conducted under subparagraph (A)(ii) shall be—

(i) consistent with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions and the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice; and

(ii) subject to the approval of the Secretary.

**SEC. 2. ADDITIONS TO ROUGH MOUNTAIN AND RICH HOLE WILDERNESSES.**

(a) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Section 1 of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(21) ROUGH MOUNTAIN ADDITION.—Certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 1,000 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rough Mountain Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, which is incorporated in the Rough Mountain Wilderness Area designated by paragraph (1).”.

(b) RICH HOLE ADDITION.—

(1) POTENTIAL WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain land in the George Washington National Forest comprising approximately 4,600 acres, as generally depicted as the ‘Rich Hole Addition’ on the map entitled ‘GEORGE WASHINGTON NATIONAL FOREST – South half – Alternative I – Selected Alternative Management Prescriptions – Land and Resources Management Plan Final Environmental Impact Statement’ and dated March 4, 2014, is designated as a potential wilderness area for incorporation in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002).

(2) WILDERNESS DESIGNATION.—The potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) shall be designated as wilderness and incorporated in the Rich Hole Wilderness Area designated by section 1(2) of Public Law 100-326 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; 102 Stat. 584; 114 Stat. 2057; 123 Stat. 1002) on the earlier of—

(A) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register notice that the activities permitted under paragraph (4) have been completed; or

(B) the date that is 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) MANAGEMENT.—Except as provided in paragraph (4), the Secretary shall manage the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.).

(4) WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—To enhance natural ecosystems within the potential wilderness area designated by paragraph (1) by implementing certain activities to improve water quality and aquatic passage, as set forth in the Forest Service document entitled “Decision Notice for the Lower Cowpasture Restoration and Management Project” and dated December 2015, the Secretary may use motorized equipment and mechanized transport in the potential wilderness area until the date on which the potential wilderness area is incorporated into the Rich Hole Wilderness Area under paragraph (2).

(B) REQUIREMENT.—In carrying out subparagraph (A), the Secretary, to the maximum extent practicable, shall use the minimum tool or administrative practice necessary to carry out that subparagraph with the least amount of adverse impact on wilderness character and resources.

**CONSTITUTING THE MAJORITY PARTY’S MEMBERSHIP ON CERTAIN COMMITTEES FOR THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS, OR UNTIL THEIR SUCCESSORS ARE CHOSEN**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 464, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 464) to constitute the majority party’s membership on certain committees for the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress, or until their successors are chosen.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed

to and that the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 464) was agreed to.

(The resolution is printed in today’s RECORD under “Submitted Resolutions.”)

**ORDERS FOR TUESDAY,  
JANUARY 7, 2020**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Now, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 10 a.m., Tuesday, January 7; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning business be closed; further, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Carranza nomination; that notwithstanding rule XXII, the postcloture time expire at 12:15 p.m. tomorrow; and that if confirmed, the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table and the President be immediately notified of the Senate’s action. Finally, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recess following the vote until 2:15 p.m. to allow for weekly conference meetings, and that at 2:15 p.m., the Senate proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 329.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

**ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.  
TOMORROW**

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 6:51 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, January 7, 2020, at 10 a.m.

**NOMINATIONS**

Executive nominations received by the Senate:

**DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE**

BRANDON LIPPS, OF TEXAS, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE FOR FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES, VICE KEVIN W. CONCANNON.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY**

JESSIE K. LIU, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY FOR TERRORISM AND FINANCIAL CRIMES, VICE SIGAL MANDELKER, RESIGNED.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

NEIL JACOBS, OF NORTH CAROLINA, TO BE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR OCEANS AND ATMOSPHERE, VICE KATHRYN D. SULLIVAN, RESIGNED.

**DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR**

KATHARINE MACGREGOR, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, VICE DAVID BERNHARDT, RESIGNED.

**NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

DAVID A. WRIGHT, OF SOUTH CAROLINA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR

THE TERM OF FIVE YEARS EXPIRING JUNE 30, 2025. (RE-APPOINTMENT)

AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION

RAMSEY COATS DAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE AFRICAN DEVELOPMENT FOUNDATION FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 22, 2021, VICE LINDA I. ETIM.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

JENNIFER YUE BARBER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE THE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR.

JENNIFER YUE BARBER, OF KENTUCKY, TO BE AN ALTERNATE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HER TENURE OF SERVICE AS REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ON THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

RAMSEY COATS DAY, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE AN ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR OF THE UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, VICE LINDA I. ETIM.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

C.J. MAHONEY, OF KANSAS, TO BE LEGAL ADVISER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, VICE JENNIFER GILLIAN NEWSTEAD, RESIGNED.

RICHARD M. MILLS, JR., OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE SESSIONS OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF THE UNITED NATIONS, DURING HIS TENURE OF SERVICE AS DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS.

RICHARD M. MILLS, JR., OF TEXAS, A CAREER MEMBER OF THE SENIOR FOREIGN SERVICE, CLASS OF MINISTER-COUNSELOR, TO BE THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA TO THE UNITED NATIONS, WITH THE RANK AND STATUS OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY AND THE DEPUTY REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN THE SECURITY COUNCIL OF THE UNITED NATIONS.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

DANIEL ASIA, OF ARIZONA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2024, VICE BRUCE CARTER, TERM EXPIRED.

WINIFRED BINGHAM, OF FLORIDA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL COUNCIL ON THE ARTS FOR A TERM EXPIRING SEPTEMBER 3, 2024, VICE OLGA VISO, TERM EXPIRED.

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

SETHURAMAN PANCHANATHAN, OF ARIZONA, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION FOR A TERM OF SIX YEARS, VICE FRANCE A. CORDOVA, TERM EXPIRING.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

WILLIAM ZOLLARS, OF KANSAS, TO BE A GOVERNOR OF THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE FOR A TERM EXPIRING DECEMBER 8, 2022, VICE JAMES H. BILBRAY, TERM EXPIRED.

THE JUDICIARY

WILLIAM SCOTT HARDY, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, VICE NORA BARRY FISCHER, RETIRED.

JOHN F. HEIL III, OF OKLAHOMA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN, EASTERN AND WESTERN DISTRICTS OF OKLAHOMA, VICE JAMES H. PAYNE, RETIRED.

DAVID CLEVELAND JOSEPH, OF LOUISIANA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA, VICE DEE D. DRELL, RETIRED. EDWARD HULVEY MEYERS, OF MARYLAND, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF FEDERAL CLAIMS FOR A TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS, VICE LAWRENCE J. BLOCK, RETIRED.

CORY T. WILSON, OF MISSISSIPPI, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI, VICE LOUIS GUIROLA, JR., RETIRED.

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD RESERVE TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203(A):

*To be rear admiral*

JAMES M. KELLY

IN THE AIR FORCE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED INDIVIDUAL FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

LORELEE L. STOCK

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR AIR FORCE UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be major*

SHANNAN L. CORBIN  
CHRISTIAN E. GAONA  
ANIKA S. V. O. POETZSCH  
JOSHUA D. YANOVIK

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be colonel*

RICHARD A. MALAGA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

TAD T. TSUNEYOSHI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

*To be major*

JOHN F. LOPEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

DIEGO L. BECERRA III

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY AS A CHAPLAIN UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

*To be major*

TIMOTHY P. BEHNKE

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MICHAEL F. COERPER

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES ARMY MEDICAL CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 624 AND 7064:

*To be major*

SANDRA L. MOLTENI

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 8132:

*To be lieutenant commander*

ADAM B. TOMLINSON

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 531:

*To be lieutenant commander*

BRIDGETTE L. RILEY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE REGULAR NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTIONS 531 AND 8132:

*To be lieutenant commander*

WARREN L. BROOKES

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant commander*

LARA H. SPENCE  
JOHN E. D. YONGE III

IN THE MARINE CORPS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

ROBERT T. DAVIS  
JAMES D. LEIBEE  
TIMOTHY G. OTTO  
ADAM W. PINKNEY  
MALACHI L. ROSS  
CLARENCE A. WOLF

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

MATTHEW S. PULTORAK  
MICHAEL P. RUEGGER  
WILLIAM J. RULLI, JR.  
BRIAN J. WALKER  
TODD J. WHITE  
JOHN D. WILLIAMS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

JEFFREY T. JONES II  
JUAN F. RODRIGUEZ

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

ENRIQUE BANDT  
MICHAEL D. BRESSLER  
NATHANIEL L. CROUCH  
THOMAS M. EPPERSON  
BRANDON D. HACKWORTH  
GLEN R. POND  
AARON F. RANCLOES  
GILBERT L. WOODS, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be major*

MICHAEL C. APICELLA, JR.  
MARK W. CHAPMAN  
JOHN C. CRUISE III  
ALAN M. GADDIS  
JOSUE MARTINEZ  
JASON D. MAXCY  
RICHARD R. OLSEN  
RAUL L. RODRIGUEZ  
BENJAMIN M. SCOTECHE  
JEFFREY A. TRANBERG

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JACKIE W. MORGAN, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JACOB R. LEWIS

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

NATHANIEL W. BAKER III  
JAMES R. STRAND

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

ROBERT W. PUCKETT

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JOHN A. YUKICA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

DAVID S. GERSEN  
CHRISTOPHER M. GILMORE  
AMBROSIO V. PANTOJA

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

JIMMY W. DARSEY  
JAY B. DURHAM  
SEAN A. PAIGE  
GERALD E. PIRK, JR.

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

RYAN M. CLEVELAND  
CHRISTIAN D. GALBRAITH

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

TYSON E. PETERS  
ISAAC RODRIGUEZ  
MICHAEL G. SMITH  
BRIAN G. WISNESKI

THE FOLLOWING NAMED LIMITED DUTY OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 624:

*To be lieutenant colonel*

MARIO A. ORTEGA

IN THE COAST GUARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2121(E), INCLUDING THOSE RESERVE OFFICERS WHO ARE TO BE APPOINTED AS PERMANENT COMMISSIONED OFFICERS PURSUANT TO TITLE 14 U.S.C., SECTION 2101:

*To be lieutenant commander*

JASON A. ACUNA  
WESLEY M. AGEE  
MARK C. AMENDOLARA  
KASEY L. ARGUELLES  
ANDREW P. ARMSTRONG  
BRIAN A. BAFFER  
NATHANIEL J. BALADAD  
SCOTT A. BALOG  
CRYSTAL A. BARNETT  
ERIC J. BARNETT  
ALFRED E. BETTS III  
THERESA J. BIGAY  
WILLIAM J. BIRCH, JR.  
MARY A. BITZER  
DAVID H. BLUE  
KATHERINE M. BLUE  
TIMOTHY A. BONNER  
ANTHONY R. BORRUSO  
MEAGAN K. BOWIS  
CHRISTOPHER A. BRADBURY  
JACOB W. BRANTLEY  
JAMES B. BRENDEL  
ZACHARY D. BROWN  
DONALD C. BRZUSKA  
COLBY K. BUCHANAN  
RAYNOR L. BUCKLEY  
IAN M. CAMPBELL  
RYAN C. CASSIDY  
DREW P. CAVANAGH  
EUGENE CHUNG  
ANDREW J. CINQUE  
ABIGAIL H. CLARK  
TREVOR L. CLARK  
TESSA R. CLAYTON  
JONNA L. CLOUSE  
GEORGE R. COCKS  
DARIN S. COLEMAN  
MELANIE L. COLLIER  
PATRICK COLLINS  
BRYAN E. CONRAD  
SARA E. CONRAD  
JESSICA CONWAY  
CAMERON D. COOPER  
LAWRENCE J. CORRADO IV  
ROY R. CROMER  
ANDREW L. DAUM  
JEFFREY S. DEITEL  
MATTHEW S. DELAHUNTY  
AARON D. DENDULK  
JOHN D. DININO  
JACOB A. DORSEY  
BRENNAN P. DOUGHERTY  
NATHANIEL P. DUFRESNE  
DOUGLAS A. EBERLY  
MATTHEW S. EDES  
KELLEY C. EDWARDS  
STEPHEN P. FAINER  
BRIAN E. FIELD  
MICHAEL D. FIORI  
ALICIA J. FLANAGAN  
COLIN M. FOGARTY  
RACHEL E. FOOTTE  
NICHOLAS A. FORNI  
CARRIE E. FOSTER  
WALTER S. FREDENHAGEN  
PATRICK A. FROST  
JASON M. GANGL  
LUIS F. GARCIA  
CHRISTOPHER J. GARDNER  
ANTHONY M. GAROFALO  
JOHN T. GATTI, JR.  
GORDON S. GERTISER  
CATHERINE M. GILLEN  
TONI A. GOODIN  
CHRISTOPHER P. GRABE  
CLIFTON J. GRAHAM  
PATRICIA G. GREEN  
MICHAEL J. GROFF  
KIRSTIN M. HAAS  
JAY B. HAGWOOD, JR.  
RORY K. HALEY  
RYAN D. HAMMOND

REMI HARRINGTON  
NICHOLAS J. HAZLETT  
ERIK S. HEITHAUS  
CHRISTOPHER L. HEPP  
JAMES L. HEUSER  
WILLIAM J. HICKEY IV  
MICHAEL P. HIGBIE  
RYAN M. HIXSON  
ZACHERY S. HOEKWATER  
JASON W. HOLSTEAD  
THOMAS E. HOREJS  
BRIAN S. HOWARD  
PETER J. HOWARD  
RYAN M. HUDSON  
CHRISTINE A. HUGHES  
LESLIE W. HUNT  
TIMOTHY L. HURST  
KEONI A. HUTTON  
KAITLIN G. INSLEY  
TORREY C. JACOBSEN  
CARLOS A. JARAMILLO  
CRAIG J. JOHNSON  
ERIC W. JOHNSON  
NICHOLAS JOKELA  
AARON R. JONES  
KAMRYN E. JONES  
JEFFREY C. JURIN  
KIRK D. KALMBACHER  
KEVIN A. KEEFE  
MATTHEW J. KEIPER  
MATTHEW T. KEITH  
JOSHUA M. KITENKO  
JODIE L. KNOX  
BRYAN C. KOCH  
RYUN J. KONZE  
GREGORY R. KOTOWITZ  
EDWARD P. KUNIGONIS  
KATHLEEN H. LAMBERT  
PAUL A. LEDBETTER  
SCOTT G. LEDEE  
OTIS C. LEONARD  
JUSTIN M. LEWIS  
STEVEN A. LEWIS  
ERIC A. LIBNER  
CHRISTOPHER G. LINDSTEDT  
JAKE R. LOBB  
JACOB J. LOMAN  
BENJAMIN C. LYONS  
JASON E. MADDUX  
JACOB M. MARKS  
CHRISTOPHER S. MARQUIS  
GERALD P. MARSHBANKS  
JACOB G. MASDANIAN  
LUKE P. MAYOTTE  
ALEXANDER J. MAZA  
LIAM P. MCCUE  
RYAN J. MCCUE  
NINA N. MCDONALD  
KATHERINE J. MCHENRY  
TRAVIS J. MCNEELY  
CHRISTOPHER F. MERCURIO  
JOSEPH W. MESSINA  
BRIDGET A. METCALF  
BRIAN J. MICHKA  
EMILY C. MILETELLO  
LAUREN L. MILICI  
ALEXANDRA S. MILLER  
STEPHANIE R. MOORE  
MARY E. MORGAN  
MICHAEL E. MOYSEOWICZ  
TRAVIS A. MURRAY  
ANTHONY J. MYERS  
CRISTINA E. NELSON  
DOUGLAS W. NEUMANN  
RYAN T. NEWMAYER  
CRAIG T. NILSON  
MEGAN S. OCONNOR  
SEAN R. ODOWD  
TIMOTHY J. OLAH  
THOMAS E. OLSEN  
IAN A. OVIATT  
ERIN L. PALMER  
BRITTANY P. PANETTA  
KEYTH A. PANKAU, JR.  
CHRIS M. PAPPÉ  
JONATHAN G. PARKHURST  
FREDERIK A. PEGNA  
SAMUEL R. PEMBERTON  
JANE R. PENA  
MEGAN J. PETERS  
IAN N. PHILLIPS DEZALIA  
ROBERT I. PICKERING  
BRIAN J. PORTER  
MATTHEW J. PRAHLER  
ERIK J. PRICE  
JOE W. PRICELARSON  
MICHAEL E. PROSSER  
SHEA A. QUINN  
JAMES A. RADER  
DAVID S. RADIN

DANIEL J. REILLY  
JAMES S. REILY  
MYLES A. RICHARDSON  
MICHAEL A. ROBERTS  
JOHN M. ROBERTSON III  
KEVIN M. ROBINSON  
MARQUESIO D. ROBINSON  
TUCKER D. RODEFFER  
PHILIP F. M. RODINO  
SARAH E. RODINO  
LUKAS G. RODRIGUEZ  
KRYSZYNA L. ROGERS  
BRYAN P. ROULEAU  
JOSEPH P. ROZYCKI  
CESAR E. RUELAS  
JEREMY C. RUNCO  
LEVI S. RUSCH  
RICHARD L. RUSSELL  
DYLAN G. SAPIA  
JANE E. SARNECKY  
KYLE M. SCHAFFNER  
JASON J. SCHAUMBURG  
PAUL T. SCHMITZ  
PETER T. SCHOFIELD  
ALEXIS D. SCOTT  
JACK C. SHADWICK  
RAPHAEL SHAMILOV  
HELEN J. SHAYE  
JAY M. SHIREY  
WILLIAM J. SIROKMAN  
URDLEY N. SMITH  
JOSHUA J. SMOLOWITZ  
CLARE M. SNYDER  
ADAM J. STANEK  
EVAN J. STECKLE  
JESSE A. SUMMERLIN  
DANIEL A. SWAIM  
RYAN C. TAYLOR  
JAMES J. TOOHEY  
NICOLE J. TOUROT  
SETH A. TREMBLE  
RIANNE S. TROUTMAN  
XIAOBIN TUO  
NASARIA E. VALADEZ  
WILLIAM M. VAN CLEAVE  
SARAH A. VANEENENAM  
FRANCIS A. VARRICHO  
JASON B. VEARA  
KATHERINE O. VOTH  
KURT S. WALKER  
ABIGAIL T. WALLIS  
LUKE A. WALSH  
ROCKY C. WARD  
JAIME B. WARE  
SELENA M. WARNKE  
THEODORE P. WARREN  
STEPHANIE E. WASHINGTON  
ERIC C. WATKINS, JR.  
JOSHUA J. WEIDMAN  
AVERY L. WESTON  
MICHAEL B. WIGHTMAN  
CHRISTIAN E. WILDHAGEN  
CRYSTAL E. WILSON  
RYAN C. WINDHAM  
STEPHANIE D. WOOD  
MARGARET W. WOODBRIDGE  
KATHARINE A. WOODS  
MIKE H. WU  
ERIK J. WYRICK  
MICHAEL A. YANEZ  
CHAD A. YEAMANS  
RORY A. YODER  
KENN A. YUEN  
DAVID L. ZITZMAN  
DAVID J. ZWIRBLIS

DISCHARGED NOMINATION

The Senate Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs was discharged from further consideration of the following nomination under the authority of the order of the Senate of 01/07/2009 and the nomination was placed on the Executive Calendar:

\*ROBERT J. FEITEL, OF MARYLAND, TO BE INSPECTOR GENERAL, NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION.

\*Nominee has committed to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.